

ZIONISM

**Enemy
of Peace and Social
progress**



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS · MOSCOW

ZIONISM - Enemy of Peace and Social Progress

ISSUE 3



Progress Publishers
Moscow

Translated from the Russian by *Barry Jones*
Designed by *Vadim Kuleshov*
Miscellany compiled by *Sergei Sergeyev*

СИОНИЗМ — ПРОТИВНИК МИРА
И СОЦИАЛЬНОГО ПРОГРЕССА

На английском языке

© Издательство «Прогресс», 1984

English translation © Progress Publishers 1984

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

С $\frac{0804000000-333}{014(01)-84}62-84$

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<i>L. Dadiani.</i> Lenin and the International Communist Movement on the Jewish Question, Anti-Semitism and Zionism . . .	5
<i>S. Sergeyev.</i> The Organisational System of International Zionism	43
<i>A. Kryukov.</i> The Strategic Alliance in the International Zionist System	95
<i>I. Zvyagelskaya.</i> The Army in the Socio-Political and Economic Structure of Israel	122
<i>N. Osipova.</i> The Zionist Lobby in Washington	152
<i>T. Znamenskaya.</i> American Neoconservatism and the Jewish Establishment	187
<i>Ye. Dmitriyev.</i> Zionist Ideas as Reflected in Israeli Government Policy on a Middle East Settlement in the Early 1980s . .	205

L. Dadiani

**LENIN
AND THE INTERNATIONAL
COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
ON THE JEWISH QUESTION,
ANTI-SEMITISM
AND ZIONISM**

The fact that Leninism is essentially founded on proletarian internationalism is one important reason for its all-conquering power. In an age of imperialism and socialist revolutions Lenin not only defended Marxist teaching on proletarian internationalism against all kinds of nationalist, revisionist and opportunist attack, but developed it further to give answers to new questions, which had never, nor indeed could ever have been posed before. Being an internationalist, he insisted, means consistently and implacably struggling against each and every deviation from the principles of proletarian unity and particularly against bourgeois nationalism. "Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism," he said, "these are the two irreconcilably hostile slogans that correspond to the two great class camps throughout the capitalist world, and express the *two* policies (nay, the two world outlooks) in the national question."¹ Lenin passionately upheld the principles of proletarian internationalism and gave a thorough and clear explanation of the way these principles manifest themselves in any specific historical situation, however complex and involved.

In tsarist Russia, of course, through the fault of the ruling classes the national question was allowed to reach acute proportions. For this reason it was a matter of primary importance for the Marxist party to draw up a scientifically grounded and politically effective programme on the national question. Thus the Bolshevik Party, which Lenin had founded, began from its very inception a decisive struggle against all forms of national oppression. It was the only party, not only in Russia but throughout the whole world, which had a scientific, practical and effective programme for solving the national question. Lenin countered the policies of national distrust and enmity which were pursued by tsarism, the land-

owners and the bourgeoisie with a consistent internationalist policy of unity among the working people of all races and nationalities. He stated that the Social-Democrats firmly supported every revolutionary movement against the tsarist regime as well as "all oppressed nationalities, persecuted religions, downtrodden social estates, etc., in their fight for equal rights".²

In an address to the Jewish workers in 1905 Lenin wrote: "In Russia the workers of all nationalities, especially those of non-Russian nationality, endure an economic and political oppression such as obtains in no other country. The Jewish workers, as a disfranchised nationality, not only suffer general economic and political oppression, but they also suffer under the yoke which deprives them of elementary civic rights. The heavier this yoke, the greater the need for the closest possible unity among the proletarians of the different nationalities; for without such unity a victorious struggle against the general oppression is impossible."³

In 1913 Lenin noted that in tsarist Russia the Jews were "isolated as a caste" and that there were "two trends among the Jews", one of which strove one way or another to strengthen this isolation, while the other aimed for closer ties with the democratic and socialist movement in those countries where Jews were to be found.⁴

Lenin's analysis of the Jewish question as an integral part of the national question throughout the country as a whole showed that the class composition of the Jewish population did not fundamentally differ from that of the other nations and nationalities of Russia. Thus in a speech entitled "Anti-Jewish Pogroms", which was delivered in March 1919 and recorded on a gramophone record, Lenin noted once more that "among the Jews there are working people, and they form the majority. They are our brothers, who, like us, are oppressed by capital; they are our comrades in the struggle for socialism. Among the Jews there are kulaks, exploiters and capitalists, just as there are among the Russians, and among people of all nations... Rich Jews, like rich Russians, and the rich in all countries, are in alliance to oppress, crush, rob and disunite the workers."⁵

The Jewish question could only be solved through the overthrow of the autocracy and the power of the bourgeoisie and the landowners and through the building of a socialist society. There-

fore Lenin and the Bolshevik Party strove to close the ranks of proletarians of all nationalities in all workers' organisations whether they were professional, cooperative, consumer, educational or otherwise as a counter to all bourgeois nationalism.

The interests of the working class, of all the working people and their struggle against tsarism and capitalism insistently demanded, as Lenin showed, fraternal solidarity and complete unity among the workers of all nationalities and the principled and consistent rejection of any nationalist ideology or nationalist policy pursued by the bourgeoisie or its agents. "We must strive to unite the workers of all nations as closely as possible, strive to unite them for a joint struggle against *all* chauvinism, against *all* national exclusiveness, against *all* nationalism."⁶

The tsarist authorities and all reactionary forces in Russia did everything they could to pervert the political consciousness of the people. They set nation against nation and religious sect against religious sect in a bid to turn the anger of the working people away from those who were really to blame for the fact that they lived in poverty and without rights, and prevent a revolution from breaking out. The bourgeois-landlord government, which was only held in power by armed force, as Lenin frequently stressed, inflamed enmity and hatred against the oppressed peoples, particularly the Jews.⁷

No politician and no political party, not only in Russia but in the world as a whole, ever opposed national oppression, particularly the oppression of the Jews and anti-Semitism, with such consistency as Lenin did. While the Jewish Bund, the Zionists,* and all the other Jewish nationalists, as well as the pogroms carried out by the anti-Semites were all aiming to separate the working Jews from the working people of other nationalities and therefore offered the Jewish workers no prospects for a better future, Lenin, the Bolshevik Party and the Russian proletariat fought actively for social, economic, political and national rights for the Jewish working people.

In the late 19th and the early 20th century it was the Bund which was mainly responsible for the spread of nationalist ideas

* The Zionists referred to here are the so-called "labour Zionists" or "social-Zionists" who took part in the workers' movement.

and moods among the Jewish working population of Russia. Before the Great October Socialist Revolution the influence of the Bund on Jewish intellectuals, artisans and workers in Russia (with the exception of those in the Bolshevik Party, of course, who were fighting for the interests of the working class and all the working people) was undoubtedly much greater than that of all the Zionist-“socialist” parties together. The opportunist and especially nationalist nature of the Bund was not as clear to a fairly large section of the Jewish working people (and for the working people of other nationalities), as well as to many of the leaders of the Second International, as was that of Zionism (despite the fact that the latter was masked by socialist slogans).

Since the leaders of the Bund declared themselves opponents of Zionism, though in fact they propagated much Zionist dogma and on a number of issues took sides with the social-Zionists, Lenin criticised the ideology and policy of the Bund and gave a Marxist analysis of the main concepts of Zionism, subjecting them to devastating criticism. He revealed the class bourgeois-nationalist nature and anti-democratic essence of Zionism and substantiated the principled Marxist attitude to it at a time when the Zionists were taking their first steps in the political arena.

In September 1901 Lenin's paper, *Iskra*, contained a criticism of the Bund, which after its Fourth Congress in April 1901 moved more and more over to a nationalist, virtually pro-Zionist position. The paper stated that the “Jewish state”, the formation of which the Zionists had declared to be the essential and only possible condition for a just, democratic solution to the Jewish question, would in reality be no “model”, “egalitarian” supra-class state, but just a “Jewish kingdom” “with its own police, gendarmes, its own bureaucracy and its own government”.⁸ That is, an exploiter, bourgeois state in which the Jewish bourgeoisie would either rule independently or with the help of the Bund and social-Zionist politicians as capitalist shop assistants.

Lenin revealed the real meaning that lay carefully hidden in the Zionist postulates and slogans and stressed that while being “absolutely untenable scientifically, the idea that the Jews form a separate nation is reactionary politically”.⁹ He also severely criticised the unscientific concept of a “world Jewish nation” stating that “unfortunately. . . this Zionist idea is absolutely false

and essentially reactionary".¹⁰ Lenin exposed the false theories of the Zionists (and of the anti-Semites) to the effect that there were no class contradictions among the Jews and there existed a "community of Jewish interests" showing that the aim of such claims was to divert the working Jews from the struggle waged by the proletariat of all nations against tsarist autocracy and the bourgeoisie.

Lenin's completely scientific and cogently presented criticism made it possible to fully expose all the various kinds of messianic-Judaistic, Zionist and Judophobic theories about the "chosen race" and the exclusive nature of the Jews, their history and current position in the world. Lenin's criticism showed convincingly that the social and political life and work of the Jews in any epoch and in all countries were subject to the objective laws of historical development. This, of course, as Lenin noted, does not mean that the history of the Jews does not have its own specific characteristics.¹¹

Like any nationalist ideology Zionism, in contrast to the world historic slogan of proletarian unity, does everything it can to promote "class peace" between the exploiters and the exploited, between the Jewish millionaires on the one hand, and the poverty-stricken and out-of-work Jewish workers on the other. "The capitalists and landowners want, at all costs, to keep the workers of different nations apart while the powers that be live splendidly together as shareholders in profitable concerns involving millions (such as the Lena Goldfields); Orthodox Christians and Jews, Russians and Germans, Poles and Ukrainians, everyone who possesses *capital*, exploit the workers of all nations in company."¹²

Lenin completely destroyed the slanderous assertions of the Zionists and members of the Bund to the effect that the Social-Democrats did not recognise the "equality" between Jew and non-Jew, that Russian workers and even Social-Democrats were imbued with anti-Semitism and that anti-Semitism was ineradicable. "To call a fight for the Zionist *idea* of a Jewish nation, for the federal *principle* of Party organisation,* a 'fight for the equality of the Jews in the world family of the proletariat' is to

* This concerns the RSDLP, which the Bundists suggested turning into a federation of "national parties".

degrade the struggle from the plane of ideas and principles to that of suspicion, incitement and fanning of historically-evolved prejudices," wrote Lenin exposing the tactical manoeuvring of the Bund social-chauvinists.¹³

Pointing out the definite link that exists between anti-Semitism and the interests of the bourgeois, not the working, strata of the population,¹⁴ Lenin wrote that the bourgeoisie had always tried to set the workers of one nationality against those of another so that they should believe that all their misfortunes come from the foreigners, the "Germans" or the "Jews", and that the only reply to this "divide and rule" policy so favoured by the exploiters was for both the German and the Jewish workers to unite to fight their German and Jewish exploiters.¹⁵

Lenin noted that the members of the Bund, while claiming to be the sole representatives of the Jewish working class, inevitably drew nearer and even formed a bloc with the Zionists. They associated themselves with Zionist dogma and inclined more and more towards separatism, nationalism and social-chauvinism. He showed that the aim of the Zionists and pro-Zionists (as well as that of the anti-Semites) was to artificially separate, isolate and oppose Jew to non-Jew and cultivate the ideas of "Jewish exclusiveness", which implied a hostile attitude to the objective and progressive process of voluntary assimilation and a virtual defence of the moods and order of the ghetto, however skilfully they might be concealed. And this ran counter to the genuine interests of the Jewish workers.¹⁶

The problem of assimilation, as Lenin frequently stressed, is not something solely connected with the Jewish question. It is an inevitable and progressive process that characterises society's present stage of development and reflects, particularly under socialism, the irreversible tendency for nations, nationalities and ethnic groups, and for their cultures, to draw closer together and makes it possible for them to eventually unite and merge in a future communist society. With reference to this objective process of voluntary integration and assimilation of all nations, nationalities and ethnic groups, the strengthening of ties between them and the mutual enrichment of their cultures, Lenin wrote in 1913: "The best Jews, those who are celebrated in world history, and have given the world foremost leaders of democracy and social-

ism, have never clamoured against assimilation. It is only those who contemplate the 'rear aspect' of Jewry with reverential awe that clamour against assimilation."¹⁷

Marxists have always considered that so long as integration and assimilation are effected on a strictly voluntary basis and not through any compulsion or force, they are a natural and progressive process, which reflects the economic and cultural unity between peoples, their consolidation, equality, friendship and brotherhood. Lenin said that the proletariat "welcomes every kind of assimilation of nations, except that which is founded on force or privilege . . .

"The proletariat cannot support any consecration of nationalism; on the contrary, it supports everything that helps to obliterate national distinctions and remove national barriers; it supports everything that makes the ties between nationalities closer and closer, or tends to merge nations. To act differently means siding with reactionary nationalist philistinism."¹⁸

Lenin particularly emphasised that from the position of the Bund and the Zionists an effective and successful struggle against anti-Semitism was impossible. Noting the need for the fullest and closest unity among the proletariat in the interests of the earliest possible victory over tsarism and capitalism, he went on to say that, "in particular, complete unity between the Jewish and non-Jewish proletariat is moreover especially necessary for a successful struggle against anti-Semitism, this despicable attempt of the government and the exploiting classes to exacerbate racial particularism and national enmity".¹⁹

The conscious proletariat of Russia has always resolutely and forcefully opposed the Jewish pogroms. Lenin noted, for example, that in Lugansk the "*unarmed workers* drove back the pogromists with their bare fists, at the risk of being shot by the police".²⁰ In March 1914 he prepared "A Bill for the Abolition of All Disabilities of the Jews and of All Restrictions on the Ground of Origin or Nationality", which was to have been introduced by the Social-Democrats at the Fourth State Duma. The Bill was designed to make citizens of all nationalities in Russia equal before the law. It repealed all laws, provisional regulations and riders to laws that imposed restrictions upon Jews in any sphere of social and political life. The Bill was published in the Bol-

shevik paper, *Put pravdy*, on March 28, 1914²¹ and made a great contribution to exposing the great-power and anti-Semitic policies of tsarism.

After the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia all laws of the tsarist regime that discriminated against the Jewish population were immediately and completely abrogated. The first years of Soviet power in Russia saw the complete eradication of the social and political roots of anti-Semitism and an end to the conditions under which it was able to develop. On July 25, 1918, when the Civil War was at its height and the counter-revolutionary forces were carrying out bloody pogroms against the Jews in those areas that were still under Whiteguard control, the Council of People's Commissars passed a decree on Lenin's initiative which outlawed anti-Semitism, declaring it to be "the downfall of the workers' and peasants' revolution".²² The decree was edited by Lenin who added to it the following instruction: "The Council of People's Commissars directs all Councils of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies to take decisive steps towards the eradication of anti-Semitism."²³

Lenin's propositions on the two trends in Jewish culture is particularly important when it comes to exposing Zionism and other Jewish nationalist currents, on the one hand, and rooting out anti-Semitism and combating the vulgar-nihilist approach to the question, on the other. Lenin showed the reactionary, bourgeois-class essence of both the abstract, mystical, supra-class slogan of a "Jewish national culture", as adopted by all Jewish nationalist parties, and the slogan of "cultural and national autonomy", which in the final analysis also serves the interests of Zionism. "The main and fundamental flaw in this programme," Lenin wrote on the subject of the slogan of "cultural and national autonomy", which apart from the Bund was supported by all Jewish bourgeois parties as well as the Mensheviks and some national bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties in outlying regions of Russia, "is that it aims at introducing the most refined, most absolute and most extreme nationalism. The gist of this programme is that every citizen registers as belonging to a particular nation, and every nation constitutes a legal entity with the right to impose compulsory taxation on its members, with national parliaments (Diets)..."²⁴ A number of Lenin's works are devoted to criticising

the anti-Marxist bourgeois-nationalist theory of "cultural and national autonomy".

Lenin protested sharply against the plans that time and time again were advanced by the most reactionary circles among the tsarist administration for segregating Jewish pupils in special Jewish secondary schools, stressing that this chauvinistic plan was completely in line with the notorious theory of "cultural and national autonomy".²⁵ He showed that on this issue the great-power chauvinist-monarchists, on the one hand, and the Jewish bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalists (among whom he included the Bund despite its love of displaying its "revolutionariness" at every step), on the other, were virtually unanimous to the extent that they formed a political bloc.

The loud polemic that had gone on for more than two decades between the Bund and the Po'ale Zion* supported by other social-Zionist groups on the Jewish question never went beyond the bounds of petty-bourgeois Jewish nationalism. By countering the social-Zionist slogans of "returning to the fatherland" and creating a "Jewish state" with the no less reactionary theory of "cultural and national autonomy", the Bund was poisoning the minds of the Jewish working people with nationalism and thereby furthering the cause of Zionism.

In February 1903 Lenin wrote in connection with the Bund's criticism of an RSDLP manifesto issued by the local Ekaterinoslav Committee and entitled "To the Jewish Workers of Ekaterinoslav"²⁶ that "the manifesto treats the sentiments, moods, and desire of the Jewish workers so considerately, with such comradely consideration, that it specially refers to and emphasises the necessity of fighting under the banner of the R.S.D.L.P. *'even for the preservation and further development of your [the manifesto addresses the Jewish workers] national culture', 'even from the standpoint of purely national interests'*".²⁷

Returning to this same problem in late 1913 Lenin said: "Jewish national culture is the slogan of the rabbis and the bourgeoisie, the slogan of our enemies. But there are other elements in Jewish culture and in Jewish history as a whole... Whoever,

* Po'ale Zion (Workers of Zion)—a pseudo-socialist Zionist party that demagogically proclaimed the "unity of Marxism and Zionism".

directly or indirectly, puts forward the slogan of Jewish 'national culture' is (whatever his good intentions may be) an enemy of the proletariat, a supporter of all that is *outmoded* and connected with *caste* among the Jewish people; he is an accomplice of the rabbis and the bourgeoisie. On the other hand, those Jewish Marxists who mingle with the Russian, Lithuanian, Ukrainian and other workers in international Marxist organisations, and make their contribution (both in Russian and in Yiddish) towards creating the international culture of the working-class movement... uphold the best traditions of Jewry by fighting the slogan of 'national culture'." ²⁸ Lenin always maintained that under capitalism "the *elements* of democratic and socialist culture are present, if only in rudimentary form, in *every* national culture, since in *every* nation there are toiling and exploited masses, whose conditions of life inevitably give rise to the ideology of democracy and socialism. But *every* nation also possesses a bourgeois culture (and most nations a reactionary and clerical culture as well) in the form, not merely of 'elements', but of the *dominant* culture. Therefore, the general 'national culture' is the culture of the landlords, the clergy and the bourgeoisie." ²⁹ And again: "There are two nations in every modern nation... There are two national cultures in every national culture. There is the Great-Russian culture of the Purishkeviches, Guchkovs and Struves—but there is also the Great-Russian culture typified in the names of Chernyshevsky and Plekhanov. There are *the same two* cultures in the Ukraine as there are in Germany, in France, in England, among the Jews, and so forth." ³⁰

While the Zionists, the Bund and other Jewish nationalists and Judaic clericals were supporting a Jewish culture that was both anti-democratic and nationalist-chauvinistic, Marxist-Leninists of all nationalities were defending what Lenin described as "the great world-progressive features of Jewish culture... its internationalism, its identification with the advanced movements of the epoch" ³¹

The reactionary trends in Jewish culture serve to strengthen religion and support Judaic clericalism, Zionism and other forms of bourgeois Jewish nationalism as distinct from the democratic, socialist trends which, together with all the other progressive forces, struggle against Zionism, imperialism and reaction and fight

for peace and friendship among peoples and for world progress, democracy and socialism.

Zionists, Judaic clericals and other enemies of the Soviet system and communism have consistently spread slanderous and provocative lies to the effect that in both the Soviet Union and other socialist countries Judaism is persecuted, that its priests and other agents are subjected to continuous harassment, that the state has a "special" policy in relation to this religion which differs from its policy towards other religions, and that discrimination is practised against Jewish culture since it is supposedly "based on religious tradition", and so on and so forth.

All these lies have no basis in reality whatsoever. Lenin frequently stressed the close ties that exist between bourgeois nationalism and clericalism, which nurture and support one another. He believed that it was necessary to struggle against them both with equal effort.

A resolution passed by the 12th Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in April 1923 noted the importance of stepping up the struggle against the "Zionist clerical and Constitutional-Democratic groups" that had replaced the former, now-dissolved Jewish parties (i.e., the Bund, the Po'ale Zion, the United Jewish Socialist Labour Party,* and the "Jewish Communist Party" (Po'ale Zion).**

The 16th Conference of the CPSU(B), which was convened in April 1929 to determine the tasks of the trade unions in the sphere of mass education, pointed to the need for systematic struggle against petty-bourgeois attitudes, prejudices and all kinds of vestiges from the capitalist period that existed among the workers and for the correct organisation and strengthening of anti-religious propaganda, the struggle against anti-Semitism, chauvinism and national exclusiveness.³²

Whereas in tsarist Russia the Jews were legally considered as a religious group, which suited both the great-power chauvinists

* The United Jewish Socialist Labour Party was formed in March 1917 following a union between the Zionist-Socialist Party and the Socialist Jewish Labour Party. It was dissolved in March 1919.

** The "Jewish Communist Party" (Po'ale Zion) was formed in August 1919 after the left wing of the Social-Zionist Party (Po'ale Zion) had split from it. It existed till the end of 1922.

and other anti-Semites on the one hand, and the Judaic clericals, the Zionists and all other Jewish bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalists including the right-wing members of the Bund on the other, after the October Revolution the Jews were given the juridical status of a nationality on the basis of a "Decree on the Freedom of Conscience, Ecclesiastical and Religious Societies", which was proposed by Lenin and passed on January 20, 1918.³³

In a draft Programme for the RCP(B), which he drew up in 1919, Lenin wrote: "The workers of those nations which under capitalism were oppressor nations must take exceptional care not to hurt the national sentiments of the oppressed nations . . . and must not only promote the actual equality, but also the development of the language and literature of the working people of the formerly oppressed nations so as to remove all traces of distrust and alienation inherited from the epoch of capitalism."³⁴

Lenin valued highly the active part played by the Jewish workers in the revolutionary struggle of the Russian proletariat. He noted that "the Jewish emancipation movement is far broader and deeper-rooted here [in Russia than in Western Europe and America.—*Author.*], thanks to the awakening of a heroic class-consciousness among the Jewish proletariat".³⁵ He stressed that "the percentage of Jews in the democratic and proletarian movements is everywhere higher than the percentage of Jews among the population",³⁶ that "the Jews furnished a particularly high percentage (compared with the total Jewish population) of leaders of the revolutionary movement", and that "they furnish a relatively high percentage of internationalists, compared with other nations".³⁷

Lenin frequently observed that, despite the efforts of the Bund leaders, many Jewish workers joined the RSDLP and that the most highly conscious section of the Jewish working people were leaving the Bund and taking up more genuine revolutionary and internationalist positions. Thus in 1913 he wrote: "Jewish workers have joined and are still joining the Party everywhere in spite of the Bund."³⁸

Lenin and the Bolshevik Party paid particular attention to exposing the so-called Zionist-Socialists, who tried to disorientate and deceive the Jewish workers and artisans by demagogically proclaiming that Zionism and socialism could be united. Marxist-Leninists showed convincingly that *none* of the Zionist fac-

tions had or could have anything in common with scientific socialism or a genuine national liberation movement. In 1906 Lenin noted that the so-called Zionist-Socialist Workers' Party was in reality a bourgeois party.³⁹ And in precisely the same way he characterised the other social-Zionist parties.

Lenin convincingly exposed the anti-scientific, reactionary character of Zionist dogma and the bourgeois-nationalist, pro-imperialist essence of Zionism itself. He also showed quite clearly how Zionism and anti-Semitism, which seemed on the surface to be mutually hostile, were in fact ideologically akin. Then, having done this, he called upon the Jewish working people to reject the Bundism and Zionism that had been thrust upon them by the bourgeoisie and its agents and to fight alongside their class brother—the proletariat of other nationalities—for the victory of socialism.

History has fully confirmed the correctness, relevance and depth of Lenin's criticism of Zionism. This principled and soundly scientific criticism can even today serve as the theoretical basis for the ideological and political struggle of the international communist movement and of all progressive forces against the theory and political practice of Zionism.

One of the first acts passed by the Soviet government on coming to power was "The Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia" which proclaimed the socialist principles of mutual relations between the various nations and nationalities of the Soviet Republic:

1. The equality and sovereignty of the peoples of Russia;
2. The right of the peoples of Russia to free self-determination up to and including secession and the formation of a separate independent state;
3. The abolition of all and sundry national and national-religious privileges and restrictions;
4. The free development of the national minorities and ethnic groups inhabiting the territory of Russia.⁴⁰

Article 22 of the first Soviet Constitution, the Constitution of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic which was adopted on June 10, 1918, stated that the RSFSR, while recognising equal rights of the citizens irrespective of their race or nationality, declared as conflicting the basic laws of the Republic the es-

tablishment or tolerance of any privileges or advantages on this basis as well as any oppression of national minorities or restriction of their equality.

Article 34 of the present Soviet Constitution, which was adopted on October 7, 1977, proclaims that "citizens of the USSR are equal before the law, without distinction of origin, social or property status, race or nationality, sex, education, language, attitude to religion, type and nature of occupation, domicile, or other status".

An important place in the Constitution is given to those provisions that are aimed at preventing national and racial discrimination in whatever form. "Citizens of the USSR of different races and nationalities have equal rights," it is stated in Article 36. "Exercise of these rights is ensured by a policy of all-round development and drawing together of all nations and nationalities of the USSR, by educating citizens in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism, and by the possibility to use their native language and the languages of other peoples of the USSR.

"Any direct or indirect limitation of the rights of citizens or establishment of direct or indirect privileges on grounds of race or nationality, and any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness, hostility or contempt, are punishable by law."

The Constitution of the USSR guarantees the national dignity of all Soviet citizens.

The Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the 26th Party Congress stated: "The national sensibilities and national dignity of every person are respected in our country. The CPSU has fought and will always resolutely fight against such attitudes alien to the nature of socialism as chauvinism or nationalism, against any nationalistic aberration, be it, say, anti-Semitism or Zionism. We are against tendencies aimed at an artificial obliteration of national identities. And, to a similar extent, we consider their artificial inflation inadmissible. It is the Party's sacrosanct duty to educate the people in a spirit of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism, to foster a sense of pride in belonging to the great integral Soviet Union."⁴¹

* * *

The international communist movement, which is based on Marxist-Leninist teaching, has always actively struggled for the just rights of each nation, people and ethnic group and has always fought consistently and resolutely against all manifestations of nationalism, chauvinism and racism. The fraternal parties, who look for guidance on the Jewish question in the works of the founders of Marxism-Leninism and the experience of the world revolutionary movement, have exposed Zionism and anti-Semitism no matter in what form they are disguised or to what extremes of demagoguery they have resorted.

Guided by the principles of Lenin's nationalities policy the Commissariat for Jewish Affairs and the Central Bureau of Jewish Communist Sections of the RCP(B) published in 1919 an address which stated: "In the name of the Jewish working people of Russia we strongly protest against the Zionists who try to tie up the destiny of the Jewish people with that of the imperialist Entente. The Jewish working people in the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic have their own socialist Motherland which together with the workers and peasants of Russia they are defending at the front against the imperialist Entente and all its agents. The Jewish question in Soviet Russia no longer exists. The Jewish working people have all civil and national rights. There are no further any obstacles to the development of Jewish culture. We need no other countries and we make no territorial claims to ownership of the land of Palestine, which we fully recognise as belonging to the working masses of Arabs and Bedouins. All the Jewish working people now in Palestine and in all other countries should have all civil rights and will have them only when the working people themselves are in power."⁴²

The All-Russia Conference of Jewish Communist Organisations and Representatives of Jewish Commissariats which was held in Moscow in June 1919 was particularly emphatic about the need to continue exposing "left" Zionists who tried, under the cover of pseudo-Marxist ideology and declarations of their loyalty to communism and the Soviet government, to propagandise Zionism among the Jewish working people, neutralise its critics and persuade the Comintern and its sections to support the "Palestinian idea". "The 'Po' ale Zion'," it is stated in the resolution of the conference, "who call themselves Communists, are in fact pro-

pounding the bourgeois idea of Zionism under the banner of communism. Such use of the communist banner to promote aims that completely contradict its principles must be fully exposed to the working masses.”⁴³

The essentially pro-imperialist nature of all types of Zionism and the counter-revolutionary subversive activity pursued by the social-Zionists in the workers’ movement were both brought up for discussion at the Second Congress of the Communist International, which was held in July-August 1920. “The Zionists,” it was noted at the congress, “are trying to get support in all countries and employing their political propaganda and agitation to serve the interests of the capitalist class. Thus the Communist International ought to take up a most resolute struggle against this movement.”⁴⁴ It was also mentioned at the congress that in order to win over the backward strata of the Jewish working people the Zionists “are trying to set up proletarian groups with Zionist trends” that “make use of communist phraseology” to dupe the workers.⁴⁵ A resolution on the national and colonial questions, to the drawing up of which Lenin had made a very considerable contribution, made the following observation: “A glaring example of the deception practised on the working class of an oppressed nation by the combined efforts of Entente imperialism and the bourgeoisie of that same nation is offered by the Zionists’ Palestine venture (and by Zionism as a whole, which, under the pretence of creating a Jewish state in Palestine in fact surrenders the Arab working people of Palestine, where the Jewish workers form only a small minority, to exploitation by England).”⁴⁶

On November 11, 1920, the CC RCP(B) published a circular for the Jewish sections of the RCP(B) and the Jewish sections of the Ukrainian Bolshevik Party on relationship to the Bund and the “Jewish Communist Party” (Po’ale Zion). In particular, this circular pointed to the necessity to conduct a resolute ideological struggle against these nationalist parties and to the impermissibility of any joint political campaigning with the “Jewish Communist Party”.

In 1920, 1921 and 1922 the Executive Committee of the Communist International (ECCI) reviewed the application of the so-called World Jewish Communist Alliance (Po’ale Zion) for affil-

iation to the Comintern. On each occasion this application was rejected with the recommendation that the alliance voluntarily dissolve itself so that Communists coming from the Jewish proletariat should be able to join the communist parties in their own countries.

"The theme of Palestine, the attempt to divert the Jewish working masses from the class struggle by propaganda in favour of large-scale Jewish settlements in Palestine, is not only nationalist and petty-bourgeois but counter-revolutionary in its effect..."⁴⁷

The Fifth Congress of the Communist Party of Palestine,^{*} which was held in July 1923, stressed the need for daily struggle against Zionism and directed Communists primarily to the task of exposing those parties and groups which disguised their real nature under the demagogic slogans of "Zionist socialism".^{**} As Meir Vilner, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel, noted in a report on the 50th Anniversary of the Communist Party of Israel, the first few years of its existence saw the Communist Party of Palestine not only conducting an insistent struggle against social-Zionism in all its forms and manifestations, such as attempts on the part of the "Jewish Communist Party" (Po'ale Zion) to cast itself in the role of a Marxist party, but also undertaking careful political and educational work designed to root out the vestiges of Zionist ideology and its influence among some members of the young Communist Party. "More than once," said Vilner, "did our Party have to contend with assaults from inside, on the part of Jewish and Arab nationalist deviationists. Their assaults were intended to hit at the Marxist-Leninist fundament of our Party, at its Jewish-Arab internationalist unity, at its relations of solidarity with the Soviet Union and with the forces of national and social liberation in the region and the world. These elements inflicted from time to time great damage on the Party and harmed its unity. How-

* In 1948 it became the Communist Party of Israel.

** Comrade Haidar, the representative of the Communist Party of Palestine, said of social-reformism in his speech to the Sixth Comintern Congress (1928): "In no colony is it so strong as in Palestine... In the struggle against the communist influence it sticks at no means—from the cruel persecution of revolutionary workers to the hoodwinking of the workers by the illusion that a 'communist paradise' would be set up in Palestine" (*International Press Correspondence*, Vol. 8, No. 72, October 17, 1928, p. 1311).

ever, the Party always succeeded in overcoming all those who undermined its path and unity; it always emerged victorious.”⁴⁸

In an open letter addressed to the Communist Party of Palestine and dated November 26, 1930, the ECCI stated: “Zionism expresses the exploiter and great-power oppressor aspirations of the Jewish bourgeoisie, which exploit the oppressed position of the Jewish national minority in Eastern Europe in the interests of preserving their own imperialist domination.” At another point it was noted in the document that Zionism was used by British imperialism for crushing the national liberation movement of the Arab masses and that it strove to turn “the Jewish population in Palestine including the semi-proletarian and proletarian strata into the tools of its own policies”. “Thus,” said the ECCI letter, “in addition to the imperialist yoke in Palestine, Zionism as the spearhead of imperialism conducts a destructive, colonial war with the local working people.”⁴⁹

Many contingents of the international communist movement waged a fierce struggle against Zionism and the various Zionist parties and groups. Great attention to this problem was paid, for example, by the Communist Party of Poland (CPP). Having given a Marxist analysis of the Jewish bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties that were then functioning in Poland, the CPP noted in its Programme (for 1932) that both the right and the “left” “Po’ale Zion” were in fact “variations of the same nationalist and counter-revolutionary party among the proletariat... and agents of bourgeois Zionism in proletarian disguise”.⁵⁰

The Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) gave a thoroughly consistent exposé of the policies of British imperialism in the Middle East in general and in Palestine in particular. It supported a united front in which the Jewish and Arab working people would fight together against the British colonialists, Zionists and Arab feudal lords. At the height of the Arab national liberation insurrection in June 1936 the Central Committee of the CPGB made a statement to the effect that Britain was holding on to Palestine from what were largely strategic considerations. The statement sharply criticised the traditional British policy of “divide and rule” and called for an alliance of Arab and Jewish workers as the only way to create a free and independent Palestine.

The essentially reactionary, pro-imperialist and racist nature of Zionist ideology and policy and their proximity to fascism were cogently argued in a work published in 1946 by Fached (Jusef Salman Jusef), the leader of the Iraqi Communist Party, who was executed in 1949 by the pro-imperialist Nuri Said regime. He laid particular stress on the enormous damage that Zionism was doing to the Jewish working people. "As for the attempts of Zionism," he wrote, "to hide behind the mask of Jewish nationalism, Jewish religion, socialism and humanitarianism, they are nothing less than shameless ploys to deceive the Jewish people, the Jewish and the international working class and world public opinion." Fached showed that Zionism had nothing in common with democracy and progress, that it "politically, economically and culturally enslaved and exploited the Jewish masses", that it was a "tool in the hands of Anglo-American imperialism" and that it helped to further its plans in the Arab countries which aimed to strengthen and expand imperialist domination.

Fached's work devoted considerable attention to showing that after the Second World War American imperialism, which from strategic considerations had ousted its ally and competitor, Britain, from the positions it once held in the Middle East, had begun to give greater support to Zionism than previously, while the Zionists in their turn had begun to rely largely on the American rather than the British monopoly bourgeoisie. Fached stressed particularly that one of the main factors that had aided and abetted imperialism and Zionism was the lack in that period of democratic freedoms in the Arab countries, the fact that the ordinary people did not have the right to form their own parties and organisations and that the Arab working class did not have the right to form its own party—the staunchest opponent of both Zionism and imperialism. Zionist and imperialist plans were also furthered, declared Fached, by the reactionary, pro-imperialist policies of the feudal-compradore circles.

Fached saw the problem of Palestine and the liberation of the Arab countries as a whole as being closely linked with the problems facing the world national liberation movement and all the other movements that opposed imperialism and reaction. After giving a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the balance of forces, he noted that the Arab national liberation movement had

“enormous forces and reserves which are superior to the forces of Zionism and its reserves”.

After the formation of the State of Israel in May 1948 international Zionism, of course, sharply stepped up its pro-imperialist, anti-communist and anti-Soviet activity. This state, which was created on the strength of a UN decision, was turned by its rulers into an imperialist gendarme in the Middle East opposed to the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples. International Zionism became, through the broad network of its organisations, one of the main tools of imperialism in its struggle against the forces of peace, democracy and socialism.

Characterising international Zionism as it exists in the world today, the Bulgarian Communist Party newspaper, *Rabotniche-sko delo*, said: “Unbridled chauvinism and frenzied anti-Sovietism are the distinguishing features of Zionism. It is no wonder that world imperialism makes use of Zionism not only for unleashing new aggressive wars, but also for carrying out ideological diversion. It is no wonder that when a fresh lot of slander has to be heaped on communism, or when a new anti-communist, anti-Soviet campaign is to be launched the strategists of imperialist ideology turn to the Zionists, their troubadours.”⁵¹ History has thus fully confirmed the correctness of those evaluations of Zionism (including its left, pseudo-socialist wing), which were made by the communist movement at a time when the real essence of Zionism and its aims had been carefully camouflaged by the most sophisticated demagogy and subtle tactical ploys and were as yet still unclear to many representatives of the world public and even to some Marxists. Therefore the struggle against the ideology and policy of Zionism and the exposure of the expansionist, aggressive policy of the rulers of Israel are considered by the international communist movement as one of the most important tasks for all progressive forces.

Communists are continually drawing the attention of progressive world opinion to the fact that Zionist leaders and theoreticians still resort with great frequency to a highly sophisticated and insidious demagogy. They are past masters of inventive tactical manoeuvre. This is why various politically inexperienced persons of both Jewish and non-Jewish origins easily fall into their traps.

"The racial oppression of the Jews," declared Khaled Bagdache, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Syria, in 1969, "which was carried out by the fascists, particularly during the Second World War, made it possible to cover up the dangerous, reactionary, chauvinistic nature of the Zionist movement. It gave the Zionist leaders and parties the opportunity of depicting any struggle against Zionism as a struggle against the Jewish people, as anti-Semitism." He went on to say that the danger of Zionism as an ideology and as a reactionary, chauvinist movement linked with world imperialism was by no means limited to the Middle East. "Therefore we believe," he declared, "that one of the tasks facing the international communist movement as a whole is the serious systematic and continuous exposure of Zionism."⁵²

At the present stage of social development the communist and workers' parties—the staunchest and most consistent opponents of all nationalism, chauvinism and racialism—who have always devoted considerable attention to the struggle against Zionism, are now equally concerned to fight against its counterpart in the capitalist countries, anti-Semitism. Zionism has not only never struggled against anti-Semitism, it has in fact been and is its ally. Communists have always stressed that both Zionism and anti-Semitism are the fruits of imperialism and have the same ideological bases, chauvinism and racism. They are component parts of imperialist anti-democratic ideology and policies.

Only Marxist-Leninists could show correctly the relationship and interrelations between anti-Semitism and Zionism (and all the other forms of Jewish nationalism, for that matter). Thus back in the 1930s Otto Heller, an active participant in the communist movement in Austria, Czechoslovakia and Germany and the author of several serious scientific works criticising Zionism, who subsequently died at the hands of the Nazi, wrote: "Zionism has been erroneously presented as a reaction to anti-Semitism. Between anti-Semitism and Zionism there is a close link, but this link has nothing to do with Zionism supposedly being engendered by anti-Semitism. Zionism depends on anti-Semitism for its existence and the disappearance of the latter would partly deprive the former of its footing."⁵³

Both Zionists and anti-Semites look upon the Jews as "aliens",

a "foreign body" in any state or society except Israel. Both anti-Semites and Zionists, in pursuit of their class and chauvinistic aims, put national and racial factors to the forefront. Both claim that the Jews live beyond and even despite the laws of history. Thus Zionists call the Jews the "chosen people", the "light of mankind", while the anti-Semites ascribe to them all the negative characteristics making them out to be the focal point of all sins and vices.

Thus, in putting forward different but essentially similar racialist theories, both the Zionists and the anti-Semites stand opposed to the objective progressive process of the voluntary assimilation of Jews, supporting instead all that is reactionary and caste-conscious in Jewish national culture, which virtually boils down to the traditions and atmosphere of the ghetto. Therefore it is not surprising that many Zionist leaders (both in the past and at present) not only do not present any real opposition to anti-Semitism, but even have a direct interest in the continuance of anti-Semitic excesses and widely cooperate with the most avid anti-Semites.

Communists, on the other hand, are proletarian internationalists. They consistently and stubbornly expose Zionist constructs intended to camouflage the nationalist, racist essence of Zionism.

The 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow expressed the interests of the whole of progressive mankind when it once more called upon all honest men in the world to unite their efforts in the struggle against the "man-hating ideology and practices of racialism . . . against racial and national discrimination, against Zionism, and anti-Semitism, all of which are fanned by reactionary capitalist forces and which they use to mislead the masses politically".⁵⁴

The struggle of the fraternal parties against imperialism, Zionism and the expansionist, hegemonist policies of the Israeli ruling circles and the Arab reactionaries is fully in accordance with the interests of all the peoples of the Middle East and serves the cause of peace in this troubled, explosive region of the world where, through the fault of US imperialism and its Zionist ally, war broke out five times in a short historical period.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has made frequent concrete and constructive proposals for a just and peaceful set-

tlement in the Middle East which would be in the interests of all the peoples and states in the area and would serve to strengthen peace throughout the world.

In September 1982 the CPSU set out six basic principles for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which met with support from the broadest sections of world public opinion.

According to the Soviet programme, the principle of the inadmissibility of seizing foreign land through aggression should be strictly observed. The Arabs should be returned all the lands that have been occupied by Israel since 1967 and the borders between Israel and its Arab neighbours should be declared immutable.

Practical guarantees should be given of the inalienable right of the Arab population of Palestine to self-determination and to the creation of its own independent state. The Palestinian refugees should be allowed to return to their homeland and to receive compensation for their lost property.

Restoration should also be made to the Arabs of East Jerusalem, where one of the main Islamic shrines is situated, and this should henceforth be considered an inalienable part of the State of Palestine. Access to all the shrines of three religions in Jerusalem should be made free to believers.

All states in the area should have the right to secure an independent existence and development, and they should all maintain full and equal mutual relations.

The state of war that exists at present should be ended and peace established between the Arab states and Israel. All sides in the conflict including Israel and the State of Palestine should pledge to mutually respect each other's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and decide all disputable issues between them peacefully, by means of negotiation.

International guarantees of settlement should be worked out and adopted, and the permanent members of the UN Security Council or the Security Council as a whole might assume the role of guarantor.

The Soviet Union has always believed that a really just and stable agreement can only be drawn up and put into practice through the collective efforts and with the participation of all

interested sides including the PLO as the only legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people.

In answer to a question from the American political correspondent, Joseph K. Smith, Yuri Andropov, the then General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said that the USSR and the USA could "work together to eliminate the most dangerous hotbeds of military conflict, such as that in the Middle East for instance".⁵⁵

Communist parties all over the world have continually exposed the insidious manoeuvre of the Zionists which consists in levelling the charge of anti-Semitism against all those who support a stable all-embracing peace in the Middle East, who stand for the just national rights of the Arab people of Palestine (including the right to the formation of its own sovereign state) and who criticise the anti-scientific, racialist dogma of Zionism and the adventurist policies of the Israeli government and the leaders of international Zionism.

"As in all political matters," said Gus Hall, General Secretary of the Communist Party USA, in a speech revealing the racist essence of the Zionist and anti-Semitic thesis of a "special Jewish character", "there is a class approach to the 'Jewish question'. There is a working-class sector, and there is a capitalist sector... A working-class attitude sees Israel as a historical reality, that must be accepted by all. But without any 'ifs', 'ands', or 'buts', it rejects and condemns Israel's policy of aggression and expansion. It understands and accepts a sense of national pride, but it rejects bourgeois nationalism, chauvinism in all its forms."⁵⁶ In their propaganda and practical activity Communists expose the lies and reactionary tendencies of Zionist and anti-Semitic dogma which assert the existence of a "special Jewish people", or a "single Jewish nation". According to Georges Marchais, "in each country the Jews are an integral part of the national community, sharing its history, interests, economic life, culture and patriotism. This is due to objective causes which can be established."⁵⁷

The *Morning Star*, which is the newspaper of the CPGB, in an article on August 30, 1967, put it this way: "The idea of the Zionist leaders that all Jews or people of Jewish origin, in Britain, France, the U.S., the Soviet Union or elsewhere outside

Israel are not part of the British, French, Soviet or American peoples, but somehow form a 'nation' apart, is profoundly reactionary and plays into the hands of the anti-Semites and other enemies of the Jews who have always claimed just this."⁵⁸

The solidarity shown by a large number of Jewish community leaders in the capitalist countries with the Zionist policies of the Israeli government has, according to Wolf Ehrlich, Chairman of the Central Control Commission of the Communist Party of Israel, "made many people in capitalist countries suspicious of these community leaders and their self-confessed 'split loyalties'". The influence of Zionism, he continues, may be twofold: "It may help the reactionary circles in spreading anti-Semitic feeling, and, on the other hand, give impulse to chauvinistic feeling in Jewish circles."⁵⁹

Basing themselves firmly on facts Communists have convincingly exposed the demagogic claims of the Zionists and their allies to the effect that Zionism is some kind of "national liberation movement", "Jewish revolution", "Jewish renaissance", or even that it has a "socialist trend". In exposing the speculation of the Zionists and anti-Semites the Communist Party of Israel, the Communist Party USA and other fraternal parties have frequently made the point that Zionism should never be identified with Judaism and that Zionism is in fact the brain child and one of the instruments not of Judaism, but of imperialism. Zionist racism does not originate from the Jewish religion and the rabbis, but from imperialism and the ideology and practice of the Jewish big bourgeoisie which is an inseparable part of the monopoly bourgeoisie and the ruling elite in the capitalist countries. And at the same time Communists have always led a consistent struggle against Judaism as against all religions, and against clerical power in Israel and in the Jewish communities in the other capitalist countries.

Communists resolutely expose all attempts on the part of Zionist propaganda and of certain bourgeois and Social-Democratic politicians to present the UN General Assembly Resolution of November 1975 (which describes Zionism as a form of racism and racial discrimination) as anti-Semitic and supposedly spearheaded against Jews and the right of the State of Israel to exist.

On the subject of the racist nature of Zionism, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Canada, William Kashtan, wrote: "Zionist ideology speaks of God's chosen people. Herr Hitler spoke of the master race. All these so-called theories are the ingredients of racism, chauvinism, oppression."⁶⁰

Ib Nørlund, one of the leaders of the Danish Communists, recalled the racist policies of the Zionist leaders against the Palestinian Arabs, when he remarked correctly in a debate on foreign policy in the Danish parliament: "Could one be surprised that this [Zionist.—*Author.*] ideology is looked upon as a way of thinking for a 'master race'."⁶¹

The exposure of Zionism and the struggle against its theory and practice have been subjects of constant attention for the Communist Party in the United States, the country with the largest Jewish population in the world. Analysing the above-mentioned UN General Assembly Resolution the CP USA declared: "Denunciation of Zionism is not anti-Semitism, not a denunciation of Israel or its people. The reactionary ruling class political ideology of Zionism is not synonymous with Israel, Judaism or world Jewry. . .

"The Resolution is not harmful to the workers and masses of the Israeli people. It is, in fact, beneficial to them, as an expression of world-wide disapproval of the Israeli ruling class splitting, anti-working class policies."⁶²

The US Communists show the real face of all the Zionist organisations from the pogrom and fascist Jewish Defence League to those which hypocritically clothe themselves in the garb of Liberals and Socialists. In recent years the Zionists have taken control over the overwhelming majority of Jewish organisations in the United States. Their intentions have been to gain influence over the whole Jewish community, and as a result of this intensive activity carried out throughout the country a noticeable swing to the right has taken place. Allying themselves with any reactionary, and not infrequently anti-Semitic groups, the Zionist leaders today are one of the main instruments of anti-Sovietism, anti-communism and racialism in the United States.

The Communist Party USA considers that the bulk of the Jew-

ish population in the country is not Zionist and need not fall under Zionist influence. But it points to the pressing need to conduct a more systematic, energetic and organised struggle against Zionism. And here, it stresses, particular responsibility lies on the Jewish comrades in the party. Active work among the Jewish American working people is being conducted by the Commission on Work among the Jewish Population, which is attached to the National Committee of the CP USA. The magazine *Jewish Affairs* which is now edited by a prominent American Communist and scholar, Herbert Aptheker, is beginning to increase its circulation.

The French Communist Party also carries out a considerable amount of political work among the Jewish community in France. In particular, it publishes a paper called *La Presse Nouvelle* (*Neie Presse*) for progressive circles among French Jews which comes out weekly in French and daily in Yiddish. The progressive organisations called the *Mouvement contre le racisme, l'antisémitisme et pour la paix* and *La Union juife de la résistance et de l'assistance mutuelle*, in which Communists play an active role, have gained notable influence among democratic sections of the Jewish population in France. Leaders of the French Communist Party and party journalists continually bring out books and articles exposing the theory and practice of Zionism and anti-Semitism and the reactionary policies of the Israeli government and give lectures to progressive Jewish gatherings. In February 1979 the French Communist Party began publishing a bulletin four times a year entitled *Oui, la liberté!* for the progressive Jewish population in the country. According to Emil Touma, one of the leaders of the Communist Party of Israel, as a result of the work of Communists the Jews in France have begun more rapidly to alienate themselves from Zionism and pro-Zionist leanings and many French Jews have begun to support the French Communist Party.

The reactionary activity of their own Zionists and the expansionist policies of ruling circles in Israel have also been systematically exposed by the Communist Parties of Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Uruguay, Venezuela and a number of other Latin American countries. The Communists in Latin America work hard among the democratic Jewish organisations and

publish newspapers and magazines for progressive Jewish circles.

The Communist Party of the Republic of South Africa has exposed the common basis that exists between the ideology and policies of Zionism and that of the South African racists. "Under the influence of analogous ideologies of national exclusiveness," wrote *The African Communist*, the organ of the Communist Party of South Africa, "the way of thinking and acting of both the African nationalist and the Israeli Zionist towards the majority of the local population among which he lives is notable for its inhumanity, an inhumanity which characterises those who look upon other peoples as a 'lower race' or 'untermenschen'."

A strong criticism of Zionist ideology and a staunch opposition of its reactionary policies have always been characteristic of the Communist Party of Israel, a Marxist-Leninist Jewish-Arab party which holds firmly to revolutionary, internationalist position. Back in October 1919, at the party's first congress, the main speaker, Itzhak Meirson, declared: "Our Party will not cease calling upon all toilers belonging to the Jewish people, who at this moment see their only salvation in Zionism: 'Blind men, see! Deaf men, hear! Hypocrites, take the mask down from your face and know that all the castles which the bourgeois Zionism wants to build here, are castles in the air! This is a building that is perhaps externally big and beautiful, but its fundament has been laid over a gunpowder magazine which is liable to explode at any moment. Don't rely on sweet promises of this or that great world power of the rulers. Look for another path, a secure one. Find the way of peace with the toiling masses of the people which live here. Remember that with every 'bergher', with every 'friend of Zion' that comes here to 'redeem' more land and to exploit its inhabitants, only more explosive is being added under the corner stones of our building."⁶³ In subsequent years the Communist Party of Israel firmly supported the principles of proletarian internationalism. Thus Eliahu Gozhanski, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel, wrote in 1948: "The unity of the Jewish and the Arab people is in the first place the unity of the Jewish and the Arab working class, and it is one of our most important tasks. . . By strengthening the internationalist foundations of our Party, the Party of the

Jewish and Arab workers, we remain true to the principles of Lenin's teaching."⁶⁴

Like the other Marxist-Leninist parties, the Communist Party of Israel has systematically exposed the Zionist theories about the "exclusiveness of the Jews", the existence of a "world Jewish nation", the "twofold loyalty" of the Jews, the "age-old existence of anti-Semitism", Zionist "socialism", the identity of Zionism, Israeli patriotism and the Judaic religion, the identity of Israel with Zionism and of the Zionists with all the Jews, the need to solve the Jewish question through the "return" of the Jews to Zion, the "aggressiveness and anti-Semitism" of the Arabs and their desire to "destroy Israel". "Hence the conclusion," the CPI stresses, that "just as in the past there was no other fundamental solution of the Jewish question, except in socialism—so it is now."⁶⁵

The Israeli Communists struggle courageously for the national rights of the Palestinian Arabs. In categorically rejecting both the claims of the Zionist extremists to the whole of Palestine and their attempts to annex part of the territories occupied since 1967, the CPI continuously stresses that the Palestinian Arabs and the Israelis have national rights and the rights of one people do not run counter to the rights of another but, on the contrary, they both have an important task to struggle together against the common enemy—imperialism, which has always followed the principle: divide and rule.

In exposing the aggressive and chauvinistic slogan of the Zionists "We or They?" as leading to racialism, permanent war and genocide, the Israeli Communists and other democrats have put forward a just, internationalist and realistic solution to the problem based on the well-known UN Resolution entitled "We and They Too".

The 18th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel in December 1976 stressed that in leading an uncompromising struggle against the ideology and policies of Zionism the Israeli Communists were simultaneously consistently and resolutely fighting for unity of action between all peace-loving forces in the country and for a broad peace front which would include all citizens of the country who were ready, despite their various ideological views, to participate in the struggle against the aggressive

and expansionist policies of the government so as to bring about a just and stable peace.

The events of recent years and the work of the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality, which is led by the Communists, together with the mass strikes and protest demonstrations against the Zionist policy of Judaisation, have shown that the struggle of the Palestinian Arabs in Israel for their rights and freedoms has entered a new stage. According to Salim El-Qassem, Member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel, "the Communists view the struggle of the Arab population as part of the general democratic movement for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East and for profound changes in Israel itself. As in the past the Party believes it must continue warning the Jewish people of the dangers of the policy of the Israeli rulers, calling on them to be more active in working to change this policy, to awaken the forces of good-will in the country and demand a stop to all punitive actions against the population of occupied Arab territories and the Arabs in Israel."⁶⁶

The CPI also opposes the discrimination carried out by the government against persons coming from Asia and Africa who form almost 60 per cent of Israeli citizens of Jewish origin. The Israeli Communists have denounced the barbaric aggression practised against Lebanon by the ruling Zionist clique and the genocide that they have carried out against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples.

The internationalist and truly patriotic slogan of the Communist Party of Israel, which reads: "With the Arab peoples against imperialism and not with imperialism against the Arab peoples", is receiving ever greater support from the working people throughout the country.

The deep Marxist analysis of the internal and external policy of Israel and the contemporary situation and the likely trends for future development of the Israeli state and society, which was given at the 19th Congress of the CPI in February 1981, clarifies the causes and motivating forces behind the barbaric actions of the Begin-Sharon clique against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples. The bloody aggression carried out by Israel in the Lebanon, the genocide against the Palestinians and Lebanese, the virtually

fascist behaviour of the Israeli military and the leadership of the Likud bloc, the further steps to cut back the already severely curtailed bourgeois-democratic institutions and the blatant disregard of the Israeli rulers for UN Resolutions are all part of the Zionist ideological programme, the very essence of Zionism, which enjoys the full backing of the United States.

Like all other progressive forces in the world, the Communist Party of Israel demands full implementation of the UN Security Council and General Assembly Resolutions on the Middle East and unmasks each and every manoeuvre like the Camp David deal, the plan for "administrative autonomy" for the Palestinians or the so-called "Jordanian option".

The Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPI issued a statement in which it subjected to sharp criticism the "Reagan Plan" for the Middle East, which was put forward on September 1, 1982. This "plan", it states in the statement, does nothing to establish a just and stable peace in the region. The "new initiative" of the United States denies the Palestinian people the right to create their own independent state, while giving Israel the right to annex part of the Arab territories occupied since 1967.

The Communist Party of Israel, it stresses in the statement, resolutely opposes Reagan's so-called "peace" programme and reiterates its belief that there can be no other way to the establishment of a just and general peace in the Middle East than the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the Arab territories that they have occupied since 1967, the creation of an independent Palestinian state to exist alongside Israel, and respect for the sovereignty and independence of all states in the region.

The revolutionary workers' movement, above all its Communist vanguard, and the national liberation movement had not only in the past (as was shown above), but have also at present to wage a stubborn campaign against the pseudo-left, in a sense especially dangerous ideology of Zionist "socialism" as well as against the activities of parties and groups which fully or partially support this ideology.

Although the history of the working-class movement and the contemporary class struggle show that there can never be any "union between Zionism and socialism" and no such thing as

“progressive Zionism”, there regularly appear groups and individuals who assert that a synthesis between Marxism and Zionism is not only possible but even necessary and who consequently try to penetrate the international communist movement.

Thus, for example, the Mikunis-Sneh group, who were expelled from the Communist Party of Israel in the mid-1960s, tried to get control over the party and turn it into a social-Zionist right-wing reformist organisation subservient to the government. These pseudo-communists carefully masked their real intentions behind left-wing phraseology and falsified well-known statements by the founders of Marxism-Leninism on the Jewish question in a bid to propagandise Zionist dogma and Zionist policies among progressive circles in Israel and a number of other countries. They even went so far as to justify and support the Israeli aggression against the Arab states in 1967, to declare the war of 1973 a “defensive” war and to defend the actions of the Israeli authorities in the occupied territories.

This group not only joined the Zionist parties in conducting a slanderous and inflammatory campaign against the Communist Party of Israel, but even tried to undermine the activity of the international communist movement and left-wing circles in several countries. Acting in concert with various revisionist and nationalist elements they made a request in 1968 to the international communist movement to review Lenin’s position on Zionism. They cherished the idea of setting up an international Zionist organisation that would be broader than the World Zionist Organisation and that could function in all countries of the world with a Jewish population.

The symbiosis of “left-wing Zionism” and right-wing revisionism propagandised by this group and their calls for the creation of a bloc of pseudo-communists, Zionist-Socialists and “religious supporters of socialism” for the building of a “socialist Israel” in actual fact suited the Israeli rulers as well as the majority of the international Zionist leaders. The Israeli government and the World Zionist Organisation provided the group with both moral and material support.

However, for all their support from the Zionist leadership, these new-fangled social-Zionists were a pitiable gathering without any real base among the working people of Israel. Some of

those, who joined the group initially, discovered its real nature and broke with it either to return to the CPI or to join other left-wing organisations. Continuously riven by contradictions and internal strife, the group was soon completely bankrupt and dissolved into a petty social-Zionist organisation.

The international communist movement branded the Mikunis-Sneh group as an agent of Zionism. All its attempts to penetrate the communist movement and the peace movement in the service of the Israeli government collapsed as did its efforts to weaken and split the peace front in Israel, which was struggling against the expansionist, anti-national policies of the government.

As a rule, bourgeois nationalism and revisionism mutually feed and condition each other. The overwhelming majority of former Communists of whatever nationality that have adopted Zionist or pro-Zionist positions have always become right-wing (sometimes "right-leftist") revisionists. Thus the renegades Ernst Fischer and Franz Marek, who were expelled from the Communist Party of Austria for anti-party, right-wing revisionist activity, came out with numerous pro-Zionist statements.

In union with right-wing revisionists the Zionists tried to undertake subversion in Poland in 1968 and again between 1980 and 1982, and in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and 1969. They tried to make the governments of these countries refuse their support for the Arabs and restore diplomatic relations with Israel, broken off since the Israeli aggression of June 1967. In 1968 right-wing forces even tried to collect signatures in Prague supporting the restoration of such relations. The Zionists, their allies and supporters tried to present Zionism as a progressive, democratic movement and to vindicate the Israeli rulers as genuine Socialists and peace-makers. The advocates of the reactionary nationalist programme of Israeli expansion did not stop at an attempt to mobilise some citizens of Jewish extraction in Czechoslovakia for the struggle against the people's power. Analysing the situation in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and in the country as a whole after the 13th Party Congress in 1966, the Plenum of the Central Committee which was held in December 1970 noted that "an important influence in the struggle against socialism in Czechoslovakia was exerted by forces that actively stood on the side of Zionism—one of the tools of international imperialism and

anti-communism". Both Polish and Czechoslovak Communist-internationalists delivered a resounding rebuff to all these intrigues.

The documents of the international communist movement emphasise that the struggle against Zionism should be carefully thought out and systematically planned in all its ramifications. Attention should continually be paid to exposing the Zionists who pose as "the defenders of the national rights of the Jews", "the champions of democracy", "peace-makers" and "humanists", and who use their false masks to camouflage their reactionary nature.

According to John Pittman, Member of the Political Bureau of the National Committee of the CP USA, and Zahi Karkabi, Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPI, "to neutralise Zionism as far as possible it is indispensable to fight it unrelentingly on all fronts—ideological, political, economic and diplomatic. The fight against Zionism is inseparable from the fight for the vital interests of progressive mankind, for lasting world peace and international security. It is also a fight for the class interests of the international proletariat, for democracy and socialism."⁸⁷

References

1. V. I. Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 26.
2. V. I. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats", *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 334.
3. V. I. Lenin, "To the Jewish Workers", *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 495.
4. V. I. Lenin, "Theses for a Lecture on the National Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 41, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971, p. 322.
5. V. I. Lenin, "Speeches on Gramophone Records", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965, pp. 252-53.
6. V. I. Lenin, "On the Question of National Policy", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 224.

7. See V. I. Lenin, "The War in China", *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 376.
8. See *Iskra*, Nos. 8, 10, IX, 1901.
9. V. I. Lenin, "The Position of the Bund in the Party", *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965, p. 100.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 100.
12. V. I. Lenin, "The Working Class and the National Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 92. See also V. I. Lenin, "Report of the C.C. of the R.S.D.L.P. to the Brussels Conference and Instructions to the C.C. Delegation", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, pp. 507-08; V. I. Lenin, "Speeches on Gramophone Records", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, pp. 252-53.
13. V. I. Lenin, "The Position of the Bund in the Party", *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 102.
14. See V. I. Lenin, "Does the Jewish Proletariat Need an 'Independent Political Party'?", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, pp. 333-34; V. I. Lenin, "The Position of the Bund in the Party", *Collected Works*, Vol. 7., pp. 101-02; V. I. Lenin, "Plan of a Lecture on the Commune", *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, pp. 206-07; V. I. Lenin, "The First of May", *Collected Works*, Vol. 8. p. 350; V. I. Lenin, "To the Jewish Workers", *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, pp. 495-98; V. I. Lenin "The Latest News", *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 435; V. I. Lenin, "The Denuoement Is at Hand", *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, pp. 450-51; V. I. Lenin, "Socialism and Religion", *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1972, pp. 86-87; V. I. Lenin, "Report on the Unity Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. A Letter to the St. Petersburg Workers", *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, pp. 330-31; V. I. Lenin, "The Reaction Is Taking to Arms", *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 512; V. I. Lenin, "Guerrilla Warfare", *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1972, pp. 214-17; V. I. Lenin, "The Elections to the Duma and the Tactics of the Russian Social-Democrats", *Collected Works*, Vol. 12, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, pp.

- 196-97; V. I. Lenin, "The Election Platform of the R.S.D.L.P.", *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1968, p. 507; V. I. Lenin, "National Equality", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 238; V. I. Lenin, "Lecture on the 1905 Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 250; V. I. Lenin, "Speeches on Gramophone Records", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, pp. 252-53.
15. See V. I. Lenin, "A Valuable Admission", *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 85.
 16. See V. I. Lenin, "The Position of the Bund in the Party", *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, pp. 100-01.
 17. V. I. Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 29.
 18. *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36.
 19. V. I. Lenin, "Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., July 17(30)-August 10(23), 1903", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 470.
 20. V. I. Lenin, "The Reaction Is Taking to Arms", *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 512.
 21. See V. I. Lenin, "The National Equality Bill", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 172.
 22. *The Decrees of the Soviet Government*, Vol. 3, Politizdat, Moscow, 1964, p. 94 (in Russian).
 23. V. Bonch-Bruyevich, "On Anti-Semitism" in *Against Anti-Semitism*, Zhizn i Znaniye Publishers, Leningrad, 1930, p. 13 (in Russian).
 24. V. I. Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, pp. 33-34.
 25. See V. I. Lenin, "'Cultural-National' Autonomy", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 503-07.
 26. See *Leaflets of the Revolutionary Social-Democratic Organisations of the Ukraine 1896-1904*, Politizdat, Kiev, 1963, p. 296 (in Russian).
 27. V. I. Lenin, "Does the Jewish Proletariat Need an 'Independent Political Party'?", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 329. "This admirable manifesto excellently explains to the Jewish workers . . . the Social-Democratic attitude towards Zionism and anti-Semitism" (*Ibid.*).

28. V. I. Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 26.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
32. See *The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and CC Plenums*, 8th edition, Vol. 2, Politizdat, Moscow, 1954, pp. 243-44 (in Russian).
33. See *The Decrees of the Soviet Government*, Vol. 1, Politizdat, Moscow, 1957, pp. 371-75 (in Russian).
34. V. I. Lenin, "Draft Programme of the R.C.P.(B.)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 127.
35. V. I. Lenin, "The Position of the Bund in the Party", *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 100.
36. V. I. Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 26.
37. V. I. Lenin, "Lecture on the 1905 Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 250.
38. V. I. Lenin, "Has *Pravda* Given Proof of Bundist Separatism?", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 175.
39. See V. I. Lenin, "A Dissenting Opinion Recorded at the All-Russian Conference of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party by the Social-Democratic Delegates from Poland, the Lettish Territory, St. Petersburg, Moscow, the Central Industrial Region and the Volga Area", *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 301.
40. See *The Decrees of the Soviet Government*, Vol. 1, p. 40 (in Russian).
41. *Documents and Resolutions. The 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1981, pp. 73-74.
42. *V. I. Lenin on the CPSU's Struggle Against Nationalism*, Politizdat, Moscow, 1975, pp. 189-90 (in Russian).
43. *Zbign natsionalnostei*, June 15, 1919.
44. *The Second Congress of the Comintern*, Moscow, 1934, p. 141 (in Russian).
45. *Ibid.*
46. *The Communist International. 1919-1943. Documents. Se-*

lected and edited by Jane Degras, Vol. 1, 1919-1922, Oxford University Press, London, 1956, p. 144.

47. *Ibid.*, pp. 365, 366.
48. *Information Bulletin. Communist Party of Israel*, Tel Aviv, No. 4, 1970, p. 10.
49. *The Programme Documents of the Communist Parties of the East*, Partizdat, Moscow, 1934, pp. 195-97 (in Russian).
50. *Political Parties in Poland, Western Byelorussia and Western Ukraine*, Byelorussia Academy of Sciences Press, Minsk, 1935, p. 235 (in Russian).
51. *Rabotnichesko delo*, September 26, 1972.
52. Khaled Bagdache, "Leninism Illuminates the Path of Development of the National Liberation Struggle" in *The Comintern and Its Revolutionary Traditions*, Politizdat, Moscow, 1969, pp. 236, 237 (in Russian).
53. Otto Heller, *Der Untergang des Judentums*, Verlag für Literatur und Politik, Vienna, 1931, p. 153.
54. *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, Peace and Socialism Publishers, Prague, 1969, p. 35.
55. *Pravda*, December 31, 1982.
56. Gus Hall, *Imperialism Today. An Evaluation of Major Issues and Events of Our Time*, International Publishers, New York, 1972, pp. 169-70.
57. *France nouvelle*, 25 février, 1973, p. 22.
58. *Morning Star*, August 30, 1967, p. 2.
59. *World Marxist Review*, No. 3, 1973, p. 28.
60. *The Canadian Tribune*, November 26, 1975, p. 5.
61. *Land og Folk*, 20. 1. 1976.
62. *Daily World*, October 28, 1975.
63. *Information Bulletin. Communist Party of Israel*, No. 4, 1970, p. 20.
64. Eliahu Gozhanski, *In the Battles for the Class and the People*, Tel Aviv, 1959, p. 262 (in Hebrew).
65. *Information Bulletin. Communist Party of Israel*, No. 4, 1969, p. 206.
66. *World Marxist Review*, No. 10, 1976, p. 41.
67. *Ibid.*, No. 3, 1977, p. 112.

S. Sergeyev

THE ORGANISATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERNATIONAL ZIONISM

The Zionist organisational structure possesses certain distinctive features. First, it is not limited to any one country or to any one geographical area; it is international. Zionists conduct their political activity in practically all the developed capitalist countries and in many of the developing states. Second, it functions on many different levels so as to embrace the most varied groups (in terms of social position, professional status, age, degree of assimilation, etc.) of the Jewish population. This explains the existence of the hundreds of "national", "regional" and "international" Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations, many of which are fronted by religious, cultural, educational, sports, philanthropic and other "Jewish" institutions. Third, the main Zionist organisations have close links with the Israeli state apparatus, of which they have to all intents and purposes become a part. This symbiosis of Israeli government institutions and Zionist organisations abroad continues to increase. Fourth, the organisational structure of international Zionism includes a whole network of lobbying institutions whose aim is to exert internal pressure on the governments, parliaments, political parties and public opinion within the different countries. Here particular importance is attached to the effect of Zionist propaganda on the mass media in the capitalist world.

The Formation of the Organisational Network of Zionism

The ideas outlined by Theodor Herzl, one of the founders of Zionism, in his book *The Jewish State* met with a certain amount of approval both among the Jewish bourgeoisie and the Jewish petty-bourgeois intelligentsia. And in order to unite his support-

ers Herzl called a World Zionist Congress. But this was not the first attempt to form a united organisation out of those who supported Jewish bourgeois nationalism.

During the 1880s several Zionist societies sprung up in Russia. One of these, which called itself Bilu, was set up in Kharkov in 1881 and had a membership of 300 or so members from the petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia. Its professed aim was emigration to Palestine and 16 of its members actually succeeded in getting there, thereby becoming the first wave of the Aliya (the ascent, which in Zionist terminology signifies emigration to Palestine). In 1884 representatives of similar Zionist organisations held a conference in Katowice at which they elected the leadership of the Lovers of Zion (Hoveve Zion) as this new trend began to call itself.¹ The president of the Lovers of Zion was Leo Pinsker and the group as a whole conducted pro-Palestinian propaganda among the Jewish population in the pale of settlement in Russia and in the West European countries.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century Jewish bourgeois organisations began to spring up in Western Europe and North America, the largest of these being the Alliance Israélite Universelle which was based in France and the Jewish Masonic Order, the B'nai B'rith (Sons of the Testament) in the United States. Formally these were philanthropic organisations but their activity undoubtedly had religious and nationalistic overtones, though they took care not to openly put forward any political programme for Jewish nationalism. While maintaining close links with the Jewish bourgeoisie the Alliance Israélite Universelle and the B'nai B'rith tried to expand their influence over Jewish communities in various countries.

Finally, mention should be made of the formation in 1891 of the masonic organisation, the B'ne Moshe (Sons of Moses), which brought together the elite of the Lovers of Zion in southern Russia. As distinct from the Lovers of Zion which the tsarist government convinced of its good intentions had given legal status to a year earlier, the B'ne Moshe operated in secret. Its leader was Ahad Ha'am, the ideologist of "spiritual" Zionism, and its members included the majority of the future leaders of Zionist political organisations.

Thus the ground on which the first Zionist Congress was called

in 1897 had largely been prepared both ideologically and organisationally. Two hundred and four "delegates" from the Jewish communities of seventeen states including Germany, Austria-Hungary, Britain, Italy, Russia, France and the United States gathered together for the congress in Basle. There was no question of the congress being in any way broadly representative. As the Zionists themselves admitted, the overwhelming majority of Jews only knew about the first congress after it had already taken place. Those who took part came to Basle on their own initiative. On the rare occasions when there were elections, these were not held by members of the community, but by a few circles.² But this situation fully suited both the organisers and the participants who were thus able to accord themselves the right to speak in the name of all the Jewish people.

In his programme speech to the congress Herzl took account of the mood of the Lovers of Zion and their slogan of "the transformation of the Jewish question into a question of Zion".³ He then went on to note that the Jews "rush into the arms of the revolutionaries"⁴ and announced that Zionism set itself the task of preventing this.

The appearance of Zionism in the political arena was carefully orchestrated to disguise its ultimate aims. The Basle Programme which for many years became the official platform for the World Zionist Organisation declared that "Zionism seeks to secure for the Jewish people a publicly recognized, legally secured home in Palestine".⁵

For the achievement of this purpose the congress envisaged the following methods:

"1. The programmatic encouragement of the settlement of Palestine . . .

"2. The unification and organisation of all Jewry into local and wider groups in accordance with the laws of their respective countries.

"3. The strengthening of Jewish self-awareness and national consciousness.

"4. Preparatory steps to obtain the consent of the various governments necessary for the fulfillment of the aims of Zionism."⁶

Thus the Basle Programme contained the main essentials for political and "spiritual" Zionism: the organisational and ideo-

logical separatism of the Jewish people of the Diaspora, the colonisation of Palestine and an alliance with the imperialist states in order to win their support for the creation of a Jewish state. This programme remained practically unchanged for over half a century and only in 1951, after the formation of the State of Israel, was it replaced by the Jerusalem Programme, which brought Zionist strategy up to date with the new situation that existed in the world.

The Basle Congress also laid down the foundations for the organisational structure of international Zionism. The World Zionist Organisation that had been formed at the congress was made up from Zionist organisations in different countries. Its day-to-day running was in the hands of a Greater Action Committee. Members were required to pay annual dues of a shekel, then approximately equal to one shilling. Until 1921 the collection and distribution of the shekel was the responsibility of the local Zionist organisations but this led to constant friction between them and the World Zionist Organisation with the result that the latter ultimately took control of the dues through its Executive Committee.

For Herzl it was the organisation of the masses that was important for the achievement of the Zionist cause; as for the masses, they remained unaffected by the formation of the World Zionist Organisation. According to Herzl's biographer, Alex Bein, "Among the Jews the Congress had the support of those who were already its partisans, or who were ready to be convinced. The masses of the assimilated Jews were hardly affected by it; their leaders renewed, in press and pulpit, their former attacks and accusations."⁷ At the Second Congress of the World Zionist Organisation Herzl proclaimed the slogan "Conquer the Community!"⁸

The struggle to win over the Jewish communities of the Diaspora made the Zionists gamble on pluralism, a move reflecting not only the tactics of the Zionist leadership, but also the internal nature of Zionism. Since there is no one Jewish nation, there can be no world Jewish classes. Zionism cannot be monolithic, for this would be in contradiction to its socio-economic base. This is reflected in the fact that membership of the World Zionist Organisation was made broadly available to representatives of various bourgeois and petty-bourgeois, religious and

secular groups on the condition that they shared the basic premises of the Zionist nationalistic programme. From the very beginning Herzl and the other leaders of the Organisation encouraged the growth of international Zionist parties that could more effectively propagate the Zionist programme among the various social strata of the Jewish population.

Zionism and the Jewish Bourgeoisie

From the very moment of its formulation political Zionism became an ideology and a policy that expressed the interests of the Jewish bourgeoisie. Zionism possesses all the characteristic features of the big bourgeoisie's nationalism. In the first place, there is the desire of the capitalist class to present its own narrow, selfish interests as the interests of the whole Jewish community and to use nationalism to justify its own domination and mask the class contradictions within the community. Second, the nationalism of the capitalist class is not only felt in domestic policy, it inevitably finds outlets in foreign political adventures. Third, bourgeois nationalism ultimately propagates the idea of national exclusiveness, of claiming for itself a special historical mission and the right of domination over other peoples. Fourth, the big bourgeoisie, including the Jewish bourgeoisie, arms itself with racist theories like national-socialism. Finally, Zionism also reflects the tendency of certain circles of the Jewish big bourgeoisie towards cosmopolitanism as a peculiar form of monopoly capital's nationalism, but only "inside out". This form is a distorted reflection of the tendency to internationalise production, to set up a single world capitalist economy. A number of prominent Jewish financial magnates had an important role to play in this.

Nevertheless, relations between the founders and leaders of the World Zionist Organisation on the one hand and Jewish Big Business on the other were not easy. The Jewish capitalists were by no means ready to throw their money away on the vague promises given them by the ideologists of Zionism. The first pre-Herzl Zionist organisations, which were composed of nationalistic petty bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, were almost completely dependent on the "philanthropy" of the Jewish

magnates. These in their turn showed a definite interest in the schemes that were appearing towards the end of the nineteenth century for Jewish mass emigration away from the teeming centres of capitalist development, where the working-class movement was beginning to gather strength. Baron Edmon de Rothschild took under his patronage the first Lovers of Zion to settle in Palestine, who naturally soon fell under his control since he had invested five million francs in the enterprise (the Lovers of Zion themselves could only scrape together some 25,000). Another baron, Moritz de Hirsch, set up the "Jewish Colonisation Association" in 1891 with a capital of two million pounds to finance Jewish emigration to Argentina.

It was to these magnates that Herzl appealed with ideas of political Zionism. He wrote numerous long letters and insistently begged an audience.

Before his ideas for a "Jewish state" were set out in brochure form, they were formulated in his "Address to the Rothschilds". But Herzl was not admitted to the Rothschilds' family council and he had to rewrite his speech in the form of a brochure designed for the general reader. However, he never gave up trying to get through to the Jewish business magnates.

Today the Zionist propagandists have invented the myth that Big Business was initially opposed to Zionism. This, of course, was not the case. The Jewish capitalists supported Jewish nationalism as one of the means for defending their class interests and were therefore by no means opponents of political Zionism. But they were unwilling to put their money into this enterprise until they had proof that their investments would be profitable. This is why Herzl and those who were to lead the political Zionists after him put so much effort into winning over the Jewish capitalists. With this aim in view they conducted subversive activity against the working-class movement and worked for the support of ruling circles in the leading imperialist powers which hoped to use Zionism to further their own interests, particularly in the Middle East. This, of course, did much to incline the Jewish capitalists to the Zionists. There was also the fact that the capitalists themselves did not always directly control the political parties that defended their interests. They mostly preferred to act in the wings, entrusting the formal leadership of the

political movements to professional politicians who came by and large from among the bourgeois intelligentsia. Furthermore, their parties were by no means limited to members of the big bourgeoisie—they included large sections of the middle and petty bourgeoisie. The class essence of Zionism as a political movement must therefore be judged not from its social composition, but from its practical activity.

According to Herzl's biographer, Alex Bein, "one of the pillars of the Zionist plan was to find a creative channel for Jewish money; as far back as the time of the 'Address to the Rothschilds' he had already accepted this principle".⁹ After the Basle Congress Herzl wrote in one of his letters: "The beautiful days are over, the lovely time when I was looked upon merely as a lunatic. From now on I shall be treated like a businessman."¹⁰ The Jewish Colonial Trust was organised, which was a bank with the impressive (for the times) capital of two million pounds sterling for which Herzl required shareholders with good reputations as businessmen. Once more he did the rounds of the Jewish magnates but this time to show them that his enterprise would be profitable and that credit was better than philanthropy. "There still lies dormant in the Jewish financial power a great deal of unused political strength. . ." Herzl wrote. "The credit policy of the big financial Jews must be placed in the service of the national idea."¹¹

The attitude of the leading Jewish bankers and industrialists to Zionism began to change when the Zionists started having talks with the European governments and offered their services to imperialists in Germany, Britain and Russia. The Jewish financial magnates saw in this a guarantee of their investments in the Zionist enterprise.

The policy adopted in 1902 to orientate the World Zionist Organisation towards England led ultimately to Herzl's reconciliation with the London Rothschilds. These were subsequently followed by other major European bankers and industrialists. Even before the First World War Baron Edmon de Rothschild declared to the Zionist leader, Chaim Weizmann: "Without me the Zionists could have done nothing, but without the Zionists my work would have been dead."¹² "If you need money," he told Weizmann, "you come to me!" James de Rothschild, Baron

Edmon's son, acted as a kind of liaison officer between the Zionists and the Rothschilds. "He attended all our meetings, but did not wish to be officially identified with us," said Weizmann in his memoirs.¹³

Step by step the relationship between the political Zionists and the Jewish big bourgeoisie became stronger. A major landmark in this relationship was the year 1917 when the October Revolution in Russia struck panic into the Zionists and Jewish magnates alike and they came out against the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in a united front. In that same year the Balfour Declaration was adopted giving official recognition on the part of the imperialists to the Zionist movement as an instrument acting in defence of their interests.

In the 1920s the whole financial structure of the World Zionist Organisation was changed. A new financial body, the Keren Hayesod, was set up to concentrate all the "philanthropic" donations into the Zionist funds together with the income from a number of investment companies that provided capital for the Jewish bourgeoisie in Palestine. A leading role among these belonged to the Palestine Economic Corporation which was headed by Louis Marshall (president of the American Jewish Committee), Felix Warburg, Samuel Untermyer, Maurice Wertheim and Bernard Flexner.¹⁴

In 1929 an attempt was made to incorporate the Jewish big bourgeoisie in the structure of international Zionism by expanding the Jewish Agency, the highest Zionist organ, which, according to the British mandate over Palestine, was given control over the local Jewish population. But this ended up with the Keren Hayesod and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, the main financial body of the American Jewish bourgeoisie, acting independently of each other. The Jewish capitalists that called themselves "non-Zionists" asked for control over the Keren Hayesod's funds in Palestine, which would be tantamount to their control over the international Zionist movement. Finally, a compromise was reached—half the places on the council of the Jewish Agency were given to Zionists and half to "non-Zionists", with the American Jewish bourgeoisie receiving not less than 40 per cent of the "non-Zionist" places.

The results of expanding the Jewish Agency were contradic-

tory. The economic crisis of 1929-1933 and the Great Depression dealt a severe blow to the newly established Agency. During the crisis donations to the Keren Hayesod were more than halved. Squabbling broke out between the partners in the Jewish Agency and the places left vacant by the "non-Zionists" were not filled. A few years later the Executive Committee of the Agency consisted of 17 Zionists and only three "non-Zionists".

Nevertheless, despite the frequent clashes between the Zionists and the capitalist "non-Zionists", they eventually began to cooperate officially. After several unsuccessful attempts a United Jewish Appeal was ultimately launched in 1939 in the United States which guaranteed the Zionists constant donations from American Jewish bourgeois philanthropic organisations. The American Jewish bourgeoisie now provided Zionism with its main financial support. From 1901 to 1939 the total donations for Zionist activity in Palestine coming from the United States amounted to 22 million dollars. Now, with the launching of the United Jewish Appeal, the size of donations rose dramatically to 200 million dollars from 1939 to 1947 and to 2,829 million dollars from 1948 to 1976. Another 600 million dollars was collected by other organisations such as the Hadassah, the Joint Distribution Committee and the National Committee for Labour Israel.

Apart from these gratuitous donations the American Jewish bourgeoisie made Israel one of the main areas for the export of capital. It is characteristic that the Israeli government set up a special organisation to handle its loans outside the framework of the World Zionist Organisation. The purpose of this organisation was to win over the American Jewish big bourgeoisie directly, and this it succeeded in doing. Of the 4.2 billion dollars of state bonds that Israel sold abroad between 1951 and 1978 3.5 billion were bought in the United States, while private investment in Israel, according to various estimates, is no less than two billion dollars.

Thus the Jewish bourgeoisie became convinced that Zionism was helping to preserve its ideological, political and economic control of the Jewish people and consequently it began to provide considerable aid and support. The Zionists themselves had,

of course, gambled on an alliance with Big Business from the very beginning.

The Zionist movement as a whole was designed to defend the capitalist system, but this aim was pursued with particularly overt zeal by two groups of bourgeois Zionist parties known as the "general" Zionists and the "revisionists".

The "General" Zionists

"General" Zionism as a trend was formed on the basis of the so-called "democratic faction" that came into being during the early congresses of the World Zionist Organisation. This faction set out to create what they called a "synthetic" or "organic" Zionism, which would bring together the adherents of both political and "spiritual" Zionism.

The "general" Zionists held important positions in the World Zionist Organisation during the 1920s. At the 12th Congress they held 73 per cent of the seats. Later, however, their influence began to weaken. Part went over to the social-Zionists as a force capable of getting the Jewish working people to colonise Palestine under Zionist control while at the same time checking the growth of revolutionary ideas among them. Weizmann wrote of an "unwritten covenant" between a small group of his friends in the so-called "general" Zionist movement and the "great mass of workers".¹⁵ Another group, that broke away from Weizmann in 1923, adopted a blatantly chauvinist stand and practically joined forces with the extreme right-wing Zionist group known as the "revisionists". Like the "revisionists" they too demanded the immediate formation of a Jewish state and implementation of the political Zionist testament. Thus, despite the ideological kinship that existed between the "general" Zionists, organisationally they split into two groups.

On the whole "general" Zionism emphasised the theory of "the building of the nation above separate ideologies, classes or groups".¹⁶ But whereas the World Union of General Zionists put forward the slogan "Break the Histadrut!", the other group, known as the World Confederation of United Zionists, was wary of putting forward directly anti-working-class slogans. One of the documents of the World Confederation of United Zionists stated:

"General Zionism considers itself the main factor making for national unity, offering a nation-wide Jewish policy."¹⁷ The Confederation was one of the initiators of the Jewish Agency expansion in 1971.

Today the World Confederation of General Zionists maintains no official contacts with any party in Israel. In its report to the 28th Congress of the World Zionist Organisation it declared: "The Confederation believes in the principle that the Zionist idea alone must constitute the sole channel through which one should give expression to the connection, identity and support of the Jewish people throughout the world for the State of Israel. The World Confederation of General Zionists constitutes therefore a non-party or, more correctly, a super-party Zionist body, and functions through its branches in 22 countries in all parts of the world except Israel."¹⁸ The main force in the Confederation comes from the Hadassah, the greatest women's Zionist organisation in the USA, together with the B'nai Zion and the Jewish League for Israel which bring together a considerable section of the American Jewish big, middle and petty bourgeoisie. Members of the Confederation held prominent positions in the World Zionist Organisation and in the Keren Hayesod where they virtually shared the leadership with the "labour Zionists" until the coming to power of the right-wing Likud bloc in Israel.

The Likud is closely linked with the second group of "general" Zionists, the World Union of General Zionists, the main role in which at present is played by the Zionist Organisation of America (previously part of the Confederation) and the Liberal Party in Israel, which is now part of the Likud bloc and second only in size to the "revisionist" Herut Party.

Zionist-Revisionists

"Revisionism" is an extreme right-wing, fascistic trend in international Zionism. It was organised during the period between the wars in the form of a militarist, fascist-style party whose aim was the immediate formation, through the use of violence, of a Jewish state (the attitude of the World Zionist Organisation during this period was to officially deny that its aim was the creation of a state). The founder of "revisionism" was Vladimir

Ze'ev Jabotinsky, a journalist from Odessa, who considered himself to be Herzl's successor and who demanded a restoration of the aims of political Zionism. Jabotinsky gained fame as one of the commanders of the Jewish Legion in the British Army during the First World War. "The Programme is not complicated," he proclaimed. "The aim of Zionism is a Jewish state. The territory—both sides of the Jordan. The system—mass colonisation. The solution of the financial problem—a national loan. These four principles cannot be realised without international sanction. Hence the commandment of the hour—a new political campaign and the militarisation of Jewish youth in Eretz Israel and the Diaspora."¹⁹ "In blood and fire Judea fell," said Jabotinsky, "in blood and fire it will arise. All great states were established by sword." With this aim in view Jabotinsky set up the para-military youth organisation Betar which modelled itself on the Brown-shirts.

Support from reactionary and even blatantly anti-Semitic forces is a time-honoured policy among the "revisionists". Jabotinsky, for example, made an agreement to form a Jewish gendarmerie in the army to help the Petlyura "government" restore its rule in the Soviet Ukraine from which it had fled. The notorious Jewish pogroms, however, that had been conducted under Petlyura, were no source of embarrassment to Jabotinsky. Then the "revisionists" concluded an agreement with the anti-Semitic government of bourgeois Poland for the training in that country of a "secret" army for the "liberation" of Palestine and its colonisation by millions of Polish Jews. The leader of one of these "revisionist" groups, Abraham Stern, even went so far as to collaborate with the Nazi Abwehr.

For many decades the "revisionists" have been in opposition to the leadership of the World Zionist Organisation and this has made it possible for the latter to disown any declarations or actions from the former and therefore appear as "responsible", "respectable" politicians having nothing in common with the "extremists". In fact, of course, this is not the case at all. "Revisionism" has always fitted perfectly into the framework of Zionist ideology and policies. It is only that its political position is stated more blatantly, without any diplomatic trickery. Thus, for example, the "revisionists" have never attempted to conceal

their flagrant anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. As for the leadership in Israel, for many years it officially claimed to be neutral so as to disguise the pro-imperialist character of its policies and it is only comparatively recently that this disguise has been cast off.

Thus, apart from anything else, "revisionism" has had a particular function to fulfil in the Zionist movement—by openly proclaiming the far-reaching plans of Zionism it allows the "official" Zionist leadership to demonstrate its "moderation" through verbally refusing to accept such maximalist objectives. In fact, of course, the "official" Zionists have with enviable consistency done all that the "revisionists" were only talking about a few years before.

Of course, there are differences between the "revisionists" and the other Zionist parties, but these only amount to questions of tactics and reflect the struggle for power between the various Zionist factions.

It was Jabotinsky's direct objective to crush Arab resistance and so "liberate" Palestine and then to annex Transjordan. He was a great admirer of Mussolini, and Achimeir, the leader of the Zionist "revisionists" in Palestine, wanted to call him II Duce. Ben Gurion, however, called him "Vladimir Hitler".²⁰ The "revisionists" denied the existence of any class differences among the Jews and consistently worked against the "labour Zionists" in a bid to take away their leadership of the Jewish community in Palestine. "All forms of the class struggle," wrote Jabotinsky, "should be considered as treason."²¹

The economic crisis and the rise of anti-Semitism in fascist Germany during the late 1920s and early 1930s gave Jabotinsky's demagoguery a definite appeal among the Jewish petty bourgeoisie which formed the social base for the Revisionist Zionist Organisation. However, despite the social composition of its supporters, "revisionism" was not originally a petty-bourgeois trend, it came into being as a reflection of the interests of the more chauvinistic, fascistic circles among Jewish Big Business. In Poland, for example, Jabotinsky's militant youth detachments, the Betar, marched through the streets singing "Germany for Hitler! Italy for Mussolini! Palestine for Us! Long Live Jabotinsky!"²²

The "revisionist" terrorist organisation, Irgun Zvai Le'umi,

which in 1942 was headed by an ardent supporter of Jabotinsky, Menachem Begin, who then became the Prime Minister of Israel, was the spearhead of international Zionism in its struggle against the Arab population of Palestine. After the formation of Israel the Irgun soon began to take on the features of a state within a state. It refused to recognise the truce agreement and, as early as 1948, showed its intentions of achieving Zionist occupation of the whole of mandated Palestine and even Transjordan. Only after the Ben Gurion government had demonstrated its readiness to use force, in the event of Begin attempting a military coup, did the "revisionists" recognise the authority of the new state and reform as an opposition party calling itself the Herut. Today the World Union of Herut-Hatzohar is one of the largest parties in the World Zionist Organisation with branches in 21 countries.

In 1965 the Herut Party in Israel joined up with the Liberal Party of "general" Zionists to form a united bloc. This bloc was further joined by a number of small ultra-right Zionist groups and in 1973 began to call itself the Likud. At the May 1977 elections the Likud won a majority and for the first time in Israeli history formed a government with the support of the religious Zionist parties. This government was headed by Menachem Begin. As was stated at the 19th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel, the coming to power of the Likud bloc meant that the country was now directly ruled by Big Business, i.e., by persons who had got rich through continued occupation of the Arab lands, through the arms race, through inflation and through lowering the living standards of the workers and middle strata. The internal policy of the Likud was to further curtail the rights of the Israeli working people and intensify annexation of the occupied Arab territories. The Begin government made no attempt to hide its aims, which amounted to prevention of a just settlement of the Middle East conflict, and stressed the need to establish ties with the most reactionary Arab circles. A clear example of this was the separate deal that was concluded with the Sadat regime.

Under the Guise of "Labour Zionism"

Right from the beginning, of course, Zionism met strong resistance from many Jewish working people, who were increasingly involved in the revolutionary struggle of the working masses in their various countries. The spread of Marxist ideas and the development of class consciousness among the Jewish proletariat seriously impeded Zionist attempts to win over the Jewish masses. Herzl knew perfectly well that the Jewish bourgeoisie would not leave the countries it was familiar with to go to Palestine and build a state. When one of his critics pointed out that only the poor people would join the immigrants, he replied quite openly that "it is precisely they whom we need first. Only desperate men make good conquerors."²³

Immediately after the First Congress of the World Zionist Organisation work began on the ideological and organisational preparations for setting up pseudo-socialist Zionist organisations. In Basle there already appeared a group of intellectuals seeking to create "a new synthesis between their Zionist sentiments and their socialist [?] consciousness".²⁴ Their ideologist, a man from Mogilev in Russia named Nahman Syrkin, had published in 1898 a brochure entitled *The Jewish Problem and the Socialist Jewish State* which first set out the basic theories of social-Zionism. These theories were a precise illustration of what Lenin meant when he said that the enemies of Marxism are often compelled to dress themselves in Marxist clothing so as to get their anti-Marxist views across to the working-class movement. "Zionism," said Syrkin in an attempt to set the Zionist platform firmly on the ground of the class struggle, "must of necessity fuse with socialism."²⁵ Syrkin wrote that "the class struggle cannot immediately aid the Jewish proletariat to the extent that it helps the general proletariat".²⁶ He claimed that "the Jewish proletariat had to fight for a Jewish homeland in Palestine" and demanded that "the assimilated Jewish middle class give national capital for Zionist purposes".²⁷ He went on to persuade the working people to support Zionism with the argument: "Zionism is a creative work of the Jews, and it, therefore, stands not in

contradiction to the class struggle but beyond it. Zionism can be accepted by each and every class of Jews."²⁸

Another theoretician of "labour Zionism", Aaron Gordon, called upon the Jewish working people to become the worker army of Zionism in Palestine. "There is only one way that can lead to our renaissance—the way of manual labour, of mobilizing all our national energies, of absolute and sacrificed devotion to our ideal and our task."²⁹ Gordon's mystical thinking, based as it was on using "Jewish labour" to force out the local Arab population, served to justify the Zionist colonisation of Palestine. He called upon the Jewish working people to refuse to participate along with other nations "in their great work for the progress of mankind" and to "create a new people" in Palestine.³⁰ He tried to hinder the development of class consciousness among the Jewish working people: "I believe that we should not even combine with Jewish workers in the Diaspora . . . much as we respect labour; they should be our allies as Jews . . . no more and no less."³¹

A slightly different nuance is to be found in the views of another pillar of social-Zionism, Ber Borochov. A former member of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party who was expelled for his nationalist views in 1900, Borochov claimed to be a theoretician of "proletarian Zionism"—pseudo-Marxist terminology that disguised the bourgeois-nationalist essence of Zionism. He claimed that "the Jewish proletariat . . . has a national interest in a territory because among alien surroundings it lacks the possibility for developing its powers for the class struggle".³² For the Jewish proletariat, he claimed, its "economic struggle is illusory because it is employed in backward branches of production and is not engaged in heavy industry". Furthermore, "the Jewish class struggle is sterile", since "the class contradictions in Jewish society are so weak".³³ Borochov tried to persuade the Jewish workers not to take up the class struggle with the rest of the working people and to build instead a new class state in Palestine together with the Jewish bourgeoisie. Only then, claimed this pseudo-Marxist, could the Jewish workers take up the struggle against the bourgeoisie.

The theories of the social-Zionists lay at the basis of a number of programmes that were put forward by Zionist "labour"

parties at the turn of the century. These parties were considerably influenced by the Economists, the Mensheviks, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and other petty-bourgeois trends in the Russia of the time. Thus the Minsk party Po'ale Zion (Workers of Zion) proclaimed: "Since even a revolution in Russia and a free political regime could not wipe out Jewish need which springs from Galuth (exile), and since the Jewish working class cannot be the agent of the Russian Revolution, the Jewish workers must stand apart from the Russian revolutionary movement."³⁴ A similar platform was also to be found in another social-Zionist party, the Ahdut Ha'avoda (Labour Union), which after unification with the Po'ale Zion (tactical differences often gave rise to splits, alliances and fresh splits among the "labour" Zionists) formed MAPAM (the Israel United Workers' Party), later to be called MAI (the Labour Party). This party took direct control over Zionist political activity first in Palestine and then in Israel.

In actual fact, MAI differs very little from the "left-Zionist" MAPAM party which laid emphasis on the colonisation and development of Palestine, while postponing indefinitely the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship, which it recognised only in words. In recent years the social-Zionists have significantly stepped up their activity among radical Jewish circles in the capitalist countries, presenting their theories as a model of "authentic socialism".

Here it should be made quite plain that social-Zionism has nothing in common with the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. On the contrary, it is a force which is deeply hostile to it. In the work "The National Question in Our Programme" Lenin wrote: "We must always and unreservedly work for the *very closest* unity of the proletariat of all nationalities, and it is only in isolated and exceptional cases that we can advance and actively support demands conducive to the establishment of a new class state."³⁶ In his "Theses on the National Question" Lenin wrote: "Social-Democracy . . . must give most emphatic warning to the proletariat and other working people of all nationalities against direct deception by the nationalistic slogans of 'their own' bourgeoisie, who with their saccharine or fiery speeches about 'our native land' try to *divide* the proletariat and

divert its attention from their bourgeois intrigues while they enter into an economic and political alliance with the bourgeoisie of other nations.”³⁸

The social-Zionist approach to the national question is radically different from that of Marxism-Leninism. “Genuine nationalism,” Ber Borochov would have us believe, “in no way obscures consciousness. It manifests itself only among the progressive elements of oppressed nations.”³⁷ But Lenin wrote: “Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism—these are the two irreconcilably hostile slogans that correspond to the two great class camps throughout the capitalist world, and express the *two* policies (nay, the two world outlooks) in the national question.”³⁸ In an article entitled “The Right of Nations to Self-Determination” he pointed out: “The bourgeoisie always places its national demands in the forefront, and does so in categorical fashion. With the proletariat, however, these demands are subordinated to the interests of the class struggle. . . . The interests of the working class and of its struggle against capitalism demand complete solidarity and the closest unity of the workers of all nations; they demand resistance to the nationalist policy of the bourgeoisie of every nationality. Hence, Social-Democrats would be deviating from proletarian policy and subordinating the workers to the policy of the bourgeoisie if they were to repudiate the right of nations to self-determination, i.e., the right of an oppressed nation to secede, or if they were to support all the national demands of the bourgeoisie of oppressed nations. It makes no difference to the hired worker whether he is exploited chiefly by the Great-Russian bourgeoisie rather than the non-Russian bourgeoisie, or by the Polish bourgeoisie rather than the Jewish bourgeoisie, etc. The hired worker who has come to understand his class interests is equally indifferent to the state privileges of the Great-Russian capitalists and to the promises of the Polish or Ukrainian capitalists to set up an earthly paradise when they obtain state privileges.”³⁹

The interests of the Jewish working people require the closest alliance with the working people of non-Jewish origins in the struggle against the domination of capital, the overthrow of which is essential if the Jewish working class is to avoid social and other types of oppression. But social-Zionists like David Ben Gurion,

for example, deny that the Jewish people are divided "into two classes, bourgeoisie and proletariat".⁴⁰ They do everything they can to strengthen the Israeli capitalist state and get the working class to cooperate with the bourgeoisie.

The ideology and policies of Zionism and the Israeli government, which for a period of 30 years has been headed by the social-Zionists, run radically counter to the interests of the Jewish working people throughout the world as well as to the national interests of the people of Israel. In the capitalist countries the social-Zionists use "socialist" demagoguery to set the Jewish working people apart from the working-class and the democratic movement, and this in practice amounts to stirring them up against their class brothers. The Zionists conduct flagrant anti-communist and anti-Soviet propaganda and are thus loyal servants of imperialism.

It is particularly worth noting that the social-Zionists are always trying to present Israel as a socialist state where socialism exists in its "authentic" form. They talk about the kibbutzim, state-owned firms and enterprises belonging to the Histadrut and the Jewish Agency as the socialist sector of the Israeli economy, whereas in fact these state enterprises and Jewish Agency-owned enterprises are nothing but a typical form of state capitalism. In Israel the state sector acts as the capital accumulator for the development of the infrastructure and those branches of the economy which are insufficiently profitable or require large-scale primary capital investment. Furthermore, the state sector serves to aid the development of the private sector, which has been carefully cultivated by the "socialist" government of "labour Zionists" over the past 30 years. Without state subsidies the majority of Israeli private firms would have gone into liquidation years ago. Finally, there are the international monopolies that dominate the Israeli economy and Israel's general dependence on the economic and financial support of imperialism together with the donations that are made by Jewish communities abroad, which amount to a kind of tax paid by the Jewish community outside Israel.

As for enterprises that belong to the Histadrut these cannot possibly be socialist in a capitalist economy. They exploit hired labour and the workers there are in a particularly difficult posi-

tion being virtually deprived of the right to strike. Claims that the kibbutzim are socialist amount to nothing more than cheap propaganda. Here there is supposedly no private ownership and no distinction between mental and physical labour. In fact, of course, the kibbutzim serve as practical confirmation of the utopian nature of "cooperative socialism". It is a well-known fact, for instance, that the members of the kibbutz flagrantly exploit hired labour by bringing in workers from outside. The share of the kibbutzim in the Israeli economy is continually decreasing. The kibbutzim and other militarised agricultural settlements are extensively used to serve the expansionist policies of the Israeli leadership for "cultivating" the occupied Arab lands, and racism and elitism are now their distinguishing social characteristics. The fuss made by Zionist propaganda over the kibbutzim deceives the Jewish working people and progressive circles in many countries, where Zionist theoreticians present the kibbutzim as cells of "micro-socialism".

Social-Zionism is now one of the main currents in the international Zionist movement. Until only very recently the World Zionist Labour Movement (the Israeli Labour Party and its branches in the capitalist countries) was the largest faction in the General Council of the World Zionist Organisation and its representatives headed executive committees for more than 40 years. The membership of the World Zionist Labour Movement is 350,000 and its branches function in dozens of capitalist countries. It is also a member of the Socialist International. In the capitalist countries many "labour Zionists" occupy prominent positions in the Social-Democratic parties and the trade unions. The local Po'ale Zion branch in England, for example, was affiliated to the Labour Party as early as 1920. It was with the active support of the "labour Zionists", or to be more precise, on their initiative, that the Labour Party set up a pro-Zionist pressure group calling itself the "Labour Friends of Israel".

No less active are the "labour Zionists" in the United States. They maintain close links with the AFL-CIO, with the Democratic Party and with the Social Democrats USA and hold a number of prominent positions in these organisations (for example, the chairman of the Social Democrats USA was the "labour Zionist", Carl Gershman). Frequently "labour Zionists" prefer to act

through organisations that are not formally Zionist, such as the Jewish Labour Committee and the United Hebrew Trades in the United States.

Another social-Zionist group is the World Union of MAPAM with branches in 22 countries apart from Israel. Formally this organisation claims to advocate "proletarian Zionism" and its activists penetrate various left and democratic organisations. But in fact its blatant chauvinist, anti-Soviet and anti-communist position makes it closer to the other Zionist parties. More actively than the other Zionist parties MAPAM stands behind the false slogan: "Zionism Is the Jewish National Liberation Movement!" But what kind of freedom can it offer the Jewish working people? Obviously, "freedom" from proletarian internationalism and class solidarity in the struggle against monopoly capital and in the fight for peace and social progress. MAPAM also played a prominent role in "liberating" Palestine from its Arab population. While claiming verbal allegiance to the idea of a bi-national state in Palestine, this "left-wing Zionist" party set up kibbutzim in the occupied territories. For many years (until the 1977 elections) MAPAM was part of the Israeli government, sharing in its expansionist and annexationist policies.

The social base of a social-Zionism is comprised of the Jewish bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia together with sections of the bureaucracy and the bureaucratic bourgeoisie in Israel. Also under the influence of social-Zionism there are sections of the Jewish working class, particularly the worker aristocracy in capitalist countries. However, the openly reactionary, pro-capitalist policies of the "labour Zionists" have led to a lessening of their influence among the Jewish working people as a whole. This is shown, in particular, by the results of the May 1977 Israeli elections which resulted in a resounding defeat for the social-Zionist coalition. The disillusion of the working people with the policies of the "labour Zionists" reached such a level that in the working-class districts of Israeli towns and cities the social-Zionists polled far fewer votes than the openly bourgeois Likud bloc. As the Israeli Communists noted: "The truth is that the Maa'rach alignment failed to solve any basic question the country faced externally and internally, followed a policy of complete dependence on US imperialism, rejected all initiatives to

resolve the Middle East question, and served the big bourgeoisie and monopolists, local and foreign. This, and the deterioration of working-class living standards and corruption of leading officials of the Labor Party, alienated from the bloc large groups.”⁴¹

Zionism and the Judaic Clergy

At the First World Zionist Organisation Congress Herzl boasted that “Zionism has already brought about something remarkable, heretofore regarded as impossible: a close union between the ultra-modern and the ultra-conservative elements of Jewry”.⁴² Zionism did indeed unite both the bourgeois and the ultra-clerical elements in Jewish communities, for here lay the means of preserving its domination over the Jewish people. Zionism made use of much of the dogma of the Judaic religion, albeit in secular form, for grounding its own theories. “Zionism,” declared Herzl at the First Zionist Congress, “is a return to the Jewish fold even before it becomes a return to the Jewish land.”⁴³ The Judaic religion is a highly effective means of spreading Zionist influence among the Jewish masses, supporting as it does with quotations from the Bible its bourgeois-nationalist policy. Ben Gurion claimed that the idea of a “chosen people” was reasonable in the secular, rational and historical sense. As Israel’s first Prime Minister he justified the colonial policy of Zionism in Palestine with the aphorism that subsequently became a slogan: “The Bible is our mandate”.⁴⁴ The then Prime Minister of Israel, Menachem Begin, who represented the “revisionist” trend in Zionism and who was for a long time opposed to Ben Gurion, was nevertheless just as insistent on using the Old Testament argument to justify the annexation of “Judea and Samaria”, as he called the occupied territories of the West Bank.

But while noting the close connection between Zionism and Judaism, it would be wrong to consider them as one and the same. Zionism is a bourgeois-nationalist ideology, which arose during the imperialist period; Judaism is a phenomenon of a different nature that fulfils different functions, though it also promotes the interests of the exploiter upper caste of Jewish communities.

When Zionism first came on to the political arena it ran up against the contradictory attitude of the Judaic clergy. In 1912 the

ultra-orthodox clergy formed their own organisation, the Agudat Israel, which was anti-Zionist. Its ideologist, Isaac Brener, considered that the Jews could only be united by the Judaic religion; that is why the ultra-orthodox spoke of the Zionists as "scoundrels" who were trying to "destroy Jewish souls".

The struggle against the ultra-orthodox opposition within the international Zionist movement was conducted by a specially formed group who called themselves "religious Zionists". They were heavily influenced by the theories of Rabbi Samuel Mohilever, the leader of the group Lovers of Zion which had preceded Herzl. What Mohilever and his adherents wanted was the creation of a theocratic Jewish state in Palestine. In a message to the First Congress of the World Zionist Organisation he declared "to the leaders of the chosen people": "I am nevertheless stating in a general way, that the Torah [the first five books of the Old Testament.—*Author.*], which is the source of our life, must be the foundation of our regeneration in the land of our fathers."⁴⁵ Another ideologist of religious Zionism, Rabbi Yehiel Michael Pines, in an article entitled "Religion Is the Source of Jewish Nationalism" (1895) called for "a national sentiment organically integrated in faith" and a "nationalism whose soul is the Torah and whose life is in its precepts and commandments".⁴⁶ Ahad Ha'am's theories of "spiritual Zionism" also greatly influenced the religious Zionists, although in their opinion he was too far influenced by secularism.

In 1902 a religious Zionist organisation calling itself the Mizrachi (Spiritual Centre) was set up in Minsk. It rejected the calls of some rabbis to break ties with the World Zionist Organisation because of the latter's allegedly excessive "free-thinking" and secularism, preferring to follow the appeal of the now late Mohilever for the unification of "all 'Sons of Zion' who are true to our cause to work in complete harmony and fraternity, even if there be among them differences of opinion regarding religion".⁴⁷

The Mizrachi Programme called for the Zionisation of Palestine and aimed to win over orthodox bourgeois and petty-bourgeois Jews through the activity of orthodox assimilationists. In an appeal to them Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook wrote: "To oppose Jewish nationalism, even in speech, and to denigrate its values is

not permissible, for the spirit of God and the spirit of Israel are identical.”⁴⁸

But propaganda was not the only weapon employed by the Zionists in the struggle against the ultra-orthodox opposition. In June 1924 De Han, a local leader of the Agudat Israel who had stirred up the orthodox Palestinian Jews against the Zionists, was killed in the street in Jerusalem. It was not until many years later that it was revealed that his assassins were members of a secret Zionist terrorist organisation. The intense rivalry between the Mizrachi and the Agudat Israel continued for many decades, but its ideological content lessened as the ultra-orthodox gradually went over to Zionism.

After the formation of the State of Israel the Agudat Israel became an official Israeli political party with its representatives having a place in the Knesseth, but it did not become a member of the World Zionist Organisation. (It does, however, have branches in the United States and other capitalist countries with which it maintains close ties.) In 1961 the ultra-orthodox were first represented in the government of the “godless” social-Zionists and later they were in the Begin government. There are two orthodox parties in Israel now, the Agudat Israel and the Po’ale Agudat Israel (which conducts propaganda among the religious workers). Both have long lost their opposition to Zionism and can now be justifiably described as “religious” Zionists. Only a few ultra-orthodox groups now remain in opposition to Zionism like the Neturei Karta in Israel, which refuses to recognise the Israeli government and which claims to be ready to form a Palestinian government in exile, and the Satmar Hassidic Sect in the United States.

The Mizrachi, which is now called the National Religious Party, is a notable force in the Israeli political arena. It has been represented in practically all the Israeli governments. In the World Zionist Organisation the religious Zionists are one of the most powerful factions with branches in 17 countries.

The fact that all the Israeli cabinets have found themselves in acute need of the support of the “religious” Zionists has given the latter a disproportionately large influence on the life of Israeli society. To take a few examples. It is forbidden to sell bread to Jews at the Passover. On Saturday all restaurants and theatres

are closed and trains and buses do not run from sunset on Friday to sunset on Saturday. The import of non-kosher food products to Israel is forbidden. In questions of marriage, divorce and other matters affecting the status of the individual, the woman is looked upon, as in Biblical times, like chattel. An Israeli woman cannot get divorced or make a will without the consent of her husband, and a divorced woman cannot marry a man whose surname is Cohen, Cogan or Cohan, since those who have these surnames are considered to be descendants of the old Jewish priest caste.

Another result of reactionary clerical influence in Israel is the clerico-fascist organisation Gush Emunim, which is the extremist wing of the religious-Zionist parties. Today this organisation spearheads Israeli annexation of the occupied territories. According to the Italian paper *Rinascita*, "the philosophy of the Gush Emunim organisation is simple. It consists in the fact that the Jews have the God-given right to full control over the Land of Israel, while the 800,000 Arabs on the West Bank are a detail that can be quietly left to the conscience of God."⁴⁹ The 19th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel noted that the National Religious Party had adopted extremist positions in accepting the ideology of the Herut on "Great Israel". Together with the Herut it leads those who want to colonise all the occupied territories and support the fascist organisation Gush Emunim.⁵⁰

The World Zionist Organisation Within the International Zionist System

Zionism works through various organisations to extend its influence over the Jewish population.

A resolution adopted at the 29th Congress of the World Zionist Organisation defines the obligations of the individual Zionist in the following way:

"a) To implement Aliya to Israel.

"b) To be an active member of the Territorial Organization.

"c) To endeavour to implement the program of the Zionist Movement.

"d) To study Hebrew, to give one's children a Jewish educa-

tion and to bring them up towards Aliya and Zionist self-fulfilment.

“e) To contribute and to be active on behalf of the Zionist funds and to participate actively in the consolidation of Israel’s economy.

“f) To play an active role in the life of one’s community and its institutions, and to endeavour to ensure their democratic nature; to strengthen Zionist influence within the community, and to intensify Jewish education.”⁵¹

Today the World Zionist Organisation has both a “horizontal” and a “vertical” structure. The “horizontal” structure is represented by the Zionist territorial federations which operate in 32 countries and bring together all the local Zionist institutions and groups as well as individual members. The largest Zionist federation is in the United States with an official membership of 1,094,641; the smallest is in Japan with only 150 members. The “vertical” structure of the World Zionist Organisation is represented by the international Zionist parties. The election of delegates to the WZO Congresses is held within the Zionist federations according to lists which are drawn up by each Zionist party or party bloc.

Each Zionist party uses its own methods for getting through to its corresponding section among the Jewish population. Here extensive use is made of specialised branches such as women’s, youth, children’s and professional organisations. A number of Zionist organisations function formally outside the World Zionist Organisation, which allows them to conceal their ideological views in philanthropic, cultural and educational activity. In other cases lack of official connection with the World Zionist Organisation, on the part of this or that group relieves the Zionist leadership of the responsibility for the activity of such overtly terrorist Zionist gangs as the notorious “Jewish Defence League”.

Despite this organisational diversification Zionism is always a reactionary force serving the interests of imperialism by campaigning against the socialist community and the international working-class and national liberation movements.

All the Zionist organisations recognise the Programme of the World Zionist Organisation which gives paramount importance

to strengthening the State of Israel and the "gathering of the exiles in Eretz Israel". At the same time they oppose the assimilation of the Jews and strengthen Jewish communities all over the world. In this connection the 29th WZO Congress adopted a special resolution demanding that "dynamic Jewish communities in the Diaspora, committed to Zionist ideals and emotionally tied to the Eretz Israel, help ensure the survival of Israel and of the Jewish people".⁵²

The Zionist parties play a key role in the World Zionist Organisation. Of the 30 members on the Executive Committee of its General Council 21 represent Zionist parties and only 9 (including 5 with the right to speak only) religious organisations. The Israeli Zionists, who head the majority of the international Zionist parties and have the largest representation at the WZO Congresses, hold the leading positions in this organisation. To a large extent the distribution of votes between the Zionist parties at the WZO Congresses depends on the results of the inter-party struggle in Israel. The composition of the Israeli delegation is determined according to the representation of the parties in the Knesseth. Therefore the defeat of the Labour Party (MAI) at the elections in May 1977 resulted in the World Labour Zionist Movement being almost halved (from 161 to 91 delegates) at the 29th Congress, which was held six months later. The highest number of seats was gained by the Likud bloc which increased its representation from 130 to 185 delegates. The second largest number of seats was taken by the World Conference of United Zionists (100 delegates). The Labour Party came only third. The "Democratic Movement for Change" party which was formed just before the elections and so far had no branches in the Diaspora won 26 seats.⁵³ The change of leadership in Israel meant that the social-Zionists lost their important posts in the World Zionist Organisation to members of the right-wing Likud bloc.

The Likud bloc, which was formed as a result of a coalition between the World Movement Herut-Hatzohar (represented in Israel by the Herut Party) and the World Federation of General Zionists (represented in Israel by the Liberal Party), made up the largest faction of the Executive Committee of the World Zionist Organisation at the 29th Congress. They had 7 seats on the

committee, while the World Labour Zionist Movement and the World Confederation of United Zionists (which is supported by the Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organisation of America, and is not connected with any parties in Israel) received 4 seats each. The World Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi Organisation (called the National Religious Party in Israel) got 3 seats, and MAPAM and the Women's International Zionist Organisation received one seat each. Apart from Zionist coalitions of a party-like type, the Executive Committee also contained "associated members" of the World Zionist Organisation. These included the World Union of Synagogues and Kahals (orthodox Judaism), the World Council of Synagogues (conservative Judaism), the World Union for Progressive Judaism (reformist Judaism) and the World Sephardi Federation, all of which had two seats each. One seat was also given to the World Maccabee Union, the Zionist international sports organisation.

Of the 30 members of the Executive Committee 20 are Israelis (one of whom has the right to speak only), 9 are Americans (3 of whom have the right to speak only) and 1 West European (with a right to speak only).

The current disposition of forces within international Zionism can be judged by the composition of delegates at the 29th Congress. All told, there were 536 delegates with the right to vote. The Israeli Zionists had the largest number of votes (200 delegates). Next came the North American Centre of International Zionism with 169 delegates (152 of whom were from the United States and 17 from Canada). Other regional Zionist groups exercised considerably less influence than the Israeli and American centres. Thus Western Europe sent 81 delegates (including 27 from Britain and 24 from France); Latin America—54 (including 21 from Argentina); the South African Centre of World Zionism had 13 delegates (12 from the Republic of South Africa itself and 1 from Rhodesia); Australia and New Zealand sent 9 and 1 delegates respectively; and all the Asiatic countries were represented by only 1 delegate from India.⁵⁴

Thus international Zionism today has two main centres—Israel and the United States, two secondary centres—Western Europe and Latin America, and two peripheral centres—the Republic of

South Africa and Australia. This is reflected in the Charter of the World Zionist Organisation according to which fixed quotas are set for the various Zionist groups. Israel has 38 per cent of the seats at congresses, the United States—29 per cent, and the other Zionists—33 per cent.

The domination of the Israeli Zionists in the leadership of the World Zionist Organisation is also reflected in its executive bodies, which they usually head and which closely coordinate their work with the government bodies in Israel. This primarily relates to the departments which in the early 1970s covered such areas as: organisation, information, immigration and absorption (aiding the immigrants to start a new life); youth immigration; agricultural settlements; youth; education and culture in the Diaspora; external relations; the press and public relations; the activities in Israel; archives; personnel; the bureau of economic and social research and the emissaries section. According to official data for the financial year 1978/79, the budget of the World Zionist Organisation amounted to 50.7 million US dollars,⁵⁵ which allowed it to operate extensively in Israel and dozens of other countries.

The Organisation Department has five regional units: the United States Unit; the Unit for English-speaking and Scandinavian countries; the Latin American Unit; the Unit for French-speaking, Southern European, and Middle Eastern countries (Belgium, France, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Iran); and the Unit for German-speaking countries and Holland. The prime function of these units, as noted in the department's report to the 28th Congress of the World Zionist Organisation, is "to represent the Zionist Executive vis-à-vis the territorial Zionist organizations and the various organizations affiliated with them as well as to advise and guide them in their activities".⁵⁶

Another important department of the World Zionist Organisation is the Immigration and Absorption Department. There are six territorial desks operating within its framework: 1) the North American desk; 2) the South American Desk; 3) the Desk for Britain, India, South Africa and Australia (i.e., the English-speaking countries); 4) the Desk for France and other French-speaking countries; 5) the East and Central European Desk; 6) the Mediterranean Desk. Prime importance is attached

to the work of this department and its emissaries abroad in the field of encouragement of immigration, reinforcement of the consciousness of immigration and dissemination of information on immigration and absorption among Jewish communities in the Diaspora.⁵⁷ Particular attention is given to persons of Jewish origin who have work skills that are needed in the Israeli economy and the state apparatus.

Thus this department plays a key role in implementing the Zionist slogan "Gathering of Jews at Zion". One of its main activities is conducting subversion against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The Zionists do everything they can to get hold of the addresses of Jewish persons living in these countries. Then they find out their educational and occupational skills and try to pressurise them into becoming candidates for immigration. In certain cases they try to inflame nationalist feelings, in others, especially if it is a matter of highly qualified specialists, they are promised all sorts of benefits in Israel. In yet other cases the Zionists resort to blackmail and intimidation. A favourite method of provocation is to send to persons who have nothing in common with them whatsoever "invitations" to Israel. Nor do the Zionists balk at working in close coordination with the Israeli secret services so as to recruit immigrants.

The department has a wide network of special institutions which it calls "Absorption Centres", where for a period of 5 months the immigrants are taught Hebrew and have to undergo massive ideological brainwashing. These centres are fee-paying and many immigrants are forced to beg loans from the Zionist financial bodies, so that in addition to the cost of their journey to Israel other large sums have to be paid. Persons who have not paid their debts to the Zionist organisations are not allowed to leave the country. Thus immigrants who become disillusioned with Israel and decide to return to their native land must spend a period of many years paying off their debts before they are allowed to leave.

Many immigrants are sent to special agricultural settlements through one of the leading departments of the World Zionist Organisation—the Agricultural Settlement Department. As was noted in the department's report to the 28th Congress, there were 293 agricultural settlements with a total population of

82,000 under its control and these settlements produced some 25 per cent of the total agricultural output of the country.⁵⁸ Today the department is involved in the implementation of a programme for building Jewish settlements, particularly in those areas of the country where the Arab population is dominant. Thus between the 24th and 25th Congresses 98 Jewish agricultural settlements were set up on Israeli territory proper, i.e., within its 1949 boundaries.

After the Israeli aggression of 1967 a special section was set up to organise the building of settlements on the occupied Arab territories. Before the Likud bloc came to power in 1977, 24 settlements had been built on the West Bank with a population of 3.5 thousand Israelis. But afterwards this programme was intensified. At the 30th Congress of the World Zionist Organisation it was stated that by the end of 1982 a further 79 settlements had been built on the West Bank, 13 on the Golan Heights and 9 in the Gaza Strip. Today there are 25 thousand Israelis living on the West Bank alone and by 1986 this figure is planned to be increased to 100 thousand. By the year 2010 there are expected to be 1.5 million Israelis living on the West Bank.

Three departments of the World Zionist Organisation are mainly concerned with inculcating Zionism among the young Jewish population in the Diaspora. This work is carried out jointly with the youth organisations of the Zionist political parties and the Israeli Ministry of Education. Thus the Youth Department has sent some 50 emissaries to the United States to work among Zionist youth and children's organisations, of which there are more than 1,000 in that country. A further 250 emissaries work in summer camps for Jewish children. Zionist activity is conducted among students at more than 200 American universities and more than 5,000 Jewish students go to Israel annually to take part in various events that are held in the summer.

The Youth Department has its own centres for training youth organisers. Soon after the formation of the State of Israel an Institute of Youth Leaders Abroad was set up there. In recent years this training has been greatly expanded. By 1982 the Institute of Youth Leaders Abroad had 3 thousand students, and more than 2,500 former graduates were working in Zionist youth organisations abroad. In addition, the leaders of the Zionist terri-

torial federations in Italy, Denmark, Sweden and Holland were all graduates of the Institute, as were 100 delegates at the 30th World Zionist Congress.

The Department for Torah Education and Culture in the Diaspora lays special stress on a "Jewish education" for Jews in the Diaspora. It thus trains teachers for Jewish schools and publishes vast amounts of teaching material that is saturated with propaganda. There are some 2 thousand Jewish schools in the United States and other capitalist countries that have connections with the Department for Torah Education and Culture in the Diaspora. In addition, the department runs a Hebrew Institute with branches in 26 countries, a teaching staff of 500 and a total student body of 12 thousand. The department organises annual courses in Israel for some 3 thousand students from abroad. The Department for Torah Education and Culture has 223 teacher-emissaries in 23 countries. Between the 29th and 30th Congresses 13 thousand students from Jewish communities abroad studied at courses organised by this department in Israel.

The Jewish Agency

Another important body within the framework of international Zionism which is closely connected with the World Zionist Organisation is the Jewish Agency. It was first proposed that this agency should be "responsible to a body representative of the Jewish people".⁵⁹ But the Zionists were not long in establishing their full control over the Jewish Agency, an organisation that collected donations for Jewish settlements in Palestine. Until the early 1970s the Jewish Agency and the World Zionist Organisation were essentially one body. This meant that the rich Jewish bourgeoisie in the United States and other leading capitalist countries who gave generously to the cause of Zionism took no official say in controlling the hundreds of millions of dollars they had contributed. After 1967, when the donations to Israel grew considerably, the non-Zionist bourgeoisie (i.e., those not represented in the World Zionist Organisation but connected with other Jewish bourgeois-nationalist organisations of a formally non-political character) demanded a reorganisation of the chief Zionist institutions. In 1969 it was decided to separate the Jewish

Agency from the World Zionist Organisation with the former being made responsible for organising the absorption of immigrants and distribution of donations in Israel.⁶⁰ Thus that section of the Jewish bourgeoisie who had previously collected donations for Israel (the United Israeli Appeal in the United States and similar organisations in other capitalist countries) were now able to control where and how these donations were to be spent. As for the World Zionist Organisation a report to the 28th Congress noted that "the special tasks of the World Zionist Movement as an active partner in the Jewish Agency are to encourage immigration, foster education and culture in the Diaspora, work among youth and students, organize and maintain the Zionist organizations and develop Zionist information work throughout the world".⁶¹

Nevertheless, it would be untrue to say that the Jewish monopolists were the same as the Zionist leaders. As Wolf Ehrlich, one of the leaders of the Communist Party of Israel, said, "when we talk about Zionism we must distinguish between the rich Jewish businessmen in the capitalist countries (except for Israel), particularly in the United States, and the Zionist leaders in Israel. The rich Jewish capitalists in the United States are an integral part of American monopoly capital. They are the partners in joint enterprises or the owners of parallel enterprises and they share the same political and economic aspirations. But at the same time they are in competition with each other for raw materials, cheap labour and the markets. Their support for Israel does not come from their ideology; on the contrary, Zionist ideology is the means of their rise."⁶²

After the reorganisation of the Jewish Agency in 1971 the new Charter put the General Council of the World Zionist Organisation on an equal footing with the representatives of the formally non-Zionist financial institutions that collected donations for Israel among the Jewish communities in the capitalist countries. Of their half of the total number of seats 30 per cent were allotted to US delegates and the remaining 20 per cent to those from the rest of the Diaspora.⁶³ The distribution of seats among the World Zionist Organisation bodies as a whole shows that the Jewish American bourgeoisie (including both official Zionists and non-Zionists) has 44.5 per cent, whereas the Israelis have 19

per cent and the bourgeois nationalists from other countries of the Diaspora 36.5 per cent. Evidently, this correlation of seats in the leading bodies of the Jewish Agency precisely reflects the influence of the various Jewish bourgeois groups, viz., American, Israeli, other capitalist states.

After its reorganisation the Jewish Agency was given control over WZO departments of immigration and absorption, youth immigration and agricultural settlements. The Jewish Agency heads the financial system of international Zionism, the skeleton of which is composed of the Keren Hayesod (the United Israeli Appeal) which collects donations for Israel in more than sixty countries. These freely given donations and the purchase of Israeli state bonds brings Tel Aviv more than one billion dollars per year. In the highest organ of the Jewish Agency, the Board of Governors, the chief posts are held by US representatives, as distinct from the Executive Committee of the World Zionist Organisation, where they are held by representatives from Israel. The chairman of the Board of Governors is Max Fisher, a multi-millionaire from Detroit. In 1979 only 7 of the 30 governors were Israelis, while 16 were American (12 non-Zionists and 4 Zionists), 2 were British and 1 came from the Keren Hayesod in Canada, Belgium, France, Australia and the Republic of South Africa each.⁶⁴

Although formally the Jewish Agency is classed as a non-Zionist organisation, in fact it bases itself entirely upon Zionist ideology and works closely with the Israeli government. The financial report of the Jewish Agency for 1980/81 noted: "Due to increased resources [in the financial year 1967/68 donations rose fourfold and remained at this level in subsequent years.—*Author.*] the Jewish Agency has been able to involve itself actively in such spheres as social insurance, education and housing, which were previously the sole concern of the Israeli government." For this reason ruling circles in Israel have been able to increase government spending on military needs and on the continuation of aggression against the Arab countries.

On the eve of the 30th Congress of the World Zionist Organisation Leon Dultzin, chairman of the Executive Committee of the World Zionist Organisation and chairman of the Executive Committee of the Jewish Agency, declared that "non-Zionists

are in reality neo-Zionists" and he called for the appropriate changes to be made in the organisational structure of the World Zionist Organisation. Despite its reorganisation in 1971 the Jewish Agency remains one of the central institutions in the organisational structure of international Zionism.

The World Jewish Congress

In recent years there has been an increase in activity on the part of the World Jewish Congress. This organisation tries to bring together Jewish communities in the capitalist and developing countries so as to achieve what it calls "world Jewish cultural and national autonomy". Although the World Jewish Congress, which was formed in 1936, is formally a non-Zionist organisation, it in point of fact relies heavily on the doctrine of "spiritual" and "cultural" Zionism in so far as it gives paramount importance to isolating the Jewish community from the peoples with whom they live in the Diaspora. The Programme of the World Jewish Congress "seeks to intensify the bonds of world Jewry with Israel as the central force in Jewish life; to strengthen solidarity among Jews everywhere and secure their rights, status, and interests as individuals and communities".⁶⁵ Thus the bourgeois-nationalist programme of the World Jewish Congress is based on the Zionist dogma of an "extraterritorial Jewish nation". Yet it does not demand obligatory Jewish emigration to Israel and this makes its platform more acceptable to the bourgeois leadership of the Jewish communities in the United States and other capitalist countries. The American Jewish bourgeoisie plays a leading role in the World Jewish Congress.

The World Jewish Congress has branches in 67 capitalist and developing countries (the United States, Canada, many countries in Central and South America, Europe, 5 African, 7 Asiatic countries, Australia and New Zealand). The coordinating centres of the Jewish communities such as the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Union of Jewish Communities of Italy, etc., are almost all members of the Congress. In the United States and France there are sections of the World Jewish Congress which include 17 and 26 organisations respectively. In addition, both the World Zionist Organisation and 22 other Zionist and pro-

Zionist international organisations are “associated” members. These latter include the international Zionist parties and such bodies as the World Hebrew Federation, the International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists, the World Federation of Jewish Journalists, the World Union of Jewish Students, and the World Federation of Jewish Fighters, Partisans, and Camp Inmates.⁶⁶

The main objective of the World Jewish Congress is the creation of an international network of “autonomous” Jewish communities and the bringing of a world “cultural and national autonomy” to the Jewish people.

As opposed to the World Zionist Organisation, where the ideas of political Zionism are predominant, the World Jewish Congress is theoretically based on the theses of “spiritual” Zionism propounded by Ahad Ha’am and his followers, as well as on the slogans of “Jewish Nationalism in the Diaspora” as proclaimed by Simon Dubnow. The World Jewish Congress has never called for an end to the Diaspora; on the contrary, it has always tried to strengthen it. And in some cases this position has led to conflicts between the Congress leaders, the Israeli government and the World Zionist Organisation. As the bourgeois sociologist Ernest Stock wrote in the *American Jewish Year Book*: “The World Jewish Congress has complemented the World Zionist Organization in areas where the latter could not operate, but, at the same time, has also been its potential rival. For this reason, the Zionist leadership’s attitude towards the World Jewish Congress from the beginning has been one of ambivalence.”⁶⁷

From the point of view of the Israeli-centrists, the Diaspora ought only to unite to support Israel and not to strengthen itself, i.e., the Jewish communities outside Israel. This position gives rise to contradictions between the bourgeoisie in Israel and the bourgeoisie in the Diaspora (particularly the American Jewish bourgeoisie) in the struggle for the leadership of “world Jewry”. According to Stock, it is clear that “the notion of an organization representing world Jewry, which might espouse a position independent of Israel, had little appeal to the state’s policymakers”.⁶⁸ In his memoirs Nahum Goldmann recalled: “Ben Gurion never showed anything but indifference and lack of understanding for the World Jewish Congress, perhaps because he was uncon-

sciously against a world Jewish organization that would have been harder for him to get along with than the existing multiplicity of bodies.”⁶⁹ However, these contradictions were not fundamental, since the leaders of both the World Jewish Congress and the World Zionist Organisation had a common platform in the shape of the reactionary theory of a “world Jewish people”.

Although the World Jewish Congress is formally a “non-Zionist” organisation, it gives considerable attention to Israel. Thus one of its official publications noted that from the moment of the formation of the State of Israel the World Jewish Congress had tried in various ways to fulfil its obligation to make relations between Israel and the Diaspora closer and mutually advantageous. In Israel there was an Executive Committee of the World Jewish Congress which included representatives of all the Jewish (i.e., Zionist) political parties that were represented in the Knesseth. Furthermore, there was a Consultative Council consisting of Israelis selected on an individual basis who were well known in the economic or scientific life of the country.⁷⁰ The leaders of the World Jewish Congress played an important role in bringing about agreement between the Israeli and West German governments on the payment of “reparations” to the Israeli government and its citizens. By exploiting its consultative status in the UN and a number of other international organisations the World Jewish Congress actively champions Israel and Jewish bourgeois nationalism.

In 1977 connections between the World Jewish Congress and the World Zionist Organisation were formalised as a result of which a number of seats on all the leading bodies in the former were reserved for representatives of the latter. Thus, for instance, Leon Dultzin, chairman of the Executive Committee of the World Zionist Organisation, became chairman of the General Council of the World Jewish Congress. Similar “organic links” were also made between the World Jewish Congress and the B’nai B’rith.

Set up in the USA in 1843 the B’nai B’rith is the oldest Jewish bourgeois-nationalist organisation. Today it has branches in 40 countries and a membership of half a million, 450,000 of whom live in the United States. The B’nai B’rith Programme, like that of the World Jewish Congress, is built on the dogma of “spiritual” Zionism and “nationalism in the Diaspora”. The leading

posts in the B'nai B'rith are held by Zionist functionaries. One of its leaders admitted that the organisation "is now playing a greater role in the fate and future of Diaspora Jewry, assuming tasks which the State of Israel cannot legitimately undertake because it is a sovereign state and cannot intrude in the affairs of other nations".⁷¹

Attempts to Form a "Super-Organisation"

There have been attempts on the part of the leadership of the World Zionist Organisation, the World Jewish Congress and the B'nai B'rith to form a "super-organisation", which would include all the main Jewish bourgeois-nationalist organisations. As early as 1946 the American Jewish Committee, together with the Anglo-Jewish Association and the Alliance Israélite Universelle in France, initiated the founding of a Consultative Council of Jewish Organisations. The B'nai B'rith also, together with the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the South African Jewish Board of Deputies, formed the Coordinating Board of Jewish Organisations. Both these "super-organisations" were entitled to consultative status in the UN which is actively used by them for conducting anti-Soviet and pro-Israeli activity under the slogan of "defence of human rights".

The most serious attempt to form a "super-organisation" was the institution in 1958 on the initiative of Nahum Goldmann of a World Conference of Jewish Organisations. It included the World Jewish Congress, the B'nai B'rith, the World Zionist Organisation and leading bodies of the Jewish communities in Britain, the Republic of South Africa, and Argentina. According to Goldmann: "The goal of this program was to create a kind of Jewish world parliament that, while not having the right to make binding decisions, would provide a world forum for all shades of Jewish opinion, from the Lubavicher Rabbi to committed Jewish Communists."⁷² This was quite obviously an attempt to constitute "world Jewish cultural and national autonomy". However, according to Goldmann, although the World Conference of Jewish Organisations "performed useful work over the years in reducing to a common denominator the viewpoints of the various organi-

zations on important international Jewish matters and sometimes it even initiated joint action", it nevertheless was not "possible to establish a comprehensive world Jewish organization".⁷³ The reason for this was the contradictions between the different groups of Jewish bourgeoisie. The World Conference of Jewish Organisations was held particularly suspect by the Israeli leaders who regarded a "super-organisation" of this kind as an attempt to strengthen the position of the leadership of the Jewish community in the United States. And this was hardly surprising in view of the fact that the post of executive director of the World Conference of Jewish Organisations was held by the executive director of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organisations. At the same time the influential American Jewish Committee did not join the Conference, since it did not wish to share its prestige with competitors.

The Role of the Israeli Government

The Israeli government looks upon the WZO/JA as a kind of drive-belt between the Jewish state on the one hand and the Diaspora on the other. In a speech to the Knesseth Prime Minister Ben Gurion said that Israel "has itself become the chief and most potent instrument to fulfill the vision of Zionism and forge the Jewish people into one", but that "its power outside its frontiers is limited" by international law. Therefore the World Zionist Organisation "has the occasion and ability to do what the state is neither able nor authorized to do".⁷⁴

On November 24, 1952, the Israeli Knesseth adopted what it called the "World Zionist Organisation-Jewish Agency for Palestine Status Law" which had the effect of bringing this organisation within the jurisdiction of Israeli law. The Law endorsed the Zionist character of the state system in Israel, while at the same time determining the aims and objectives of the World Zionist Organisation-Jewish Agency as an instrument not only of international Zionism but also of the State of Israel. Thus while the first paragraph states: "The State of Israel regards itself as the creation of the entire Jewish people", the second paragraph proclaims: "The World Zionist Organization, from its foundation five decades ago, headed the movement and efforts of the Jewish

people to realize the age-old vision of the return to its homeland and, with the assistance of other Jewish circles and bodies, carried the main responsibility for establishing the State of Israel.”⁷⁵ In this way the World Zionist Organisation was recognised as the “forefather” of the State of Israel. But the Law went on to state that both Israel and the World Zionist Organisation were linked by a single objective: “The mission of gathering in the exiles, which is the central task of the State of Israel and the Zionist movement in our days, requires constant efforts by the Jewish people in the Diaspora. The State of Israel, therefore, expects the cooperation of all Jews, as individuals and groups, in building up the State and assisting the immigration to it of the masses of the people, and regards the unity of all sections of Jewry as necessary for this purpose.”⁷⁶ Consequently, Zionism and the State of Israel are regarded as a single whole whose “mission” is “gathering in the exiles”, i.e., the mass immigration of the Jews to Israel.

The Status Law set out the “obligations” of the organisational system of international Zionism in relation to Israel and at the same time established its functions within that state. “The World Zionist Organization, which is also the Jewish Agency, takes care as before of immigration and directs absorption and settlement projects in the State,” it was stated in the third paragraph.

At the same time a system was set up under which the Israeli government could work together with the World Zionist Organisation-Jewish Agency. This was known as the Coordinating Committee which was supposed to represent both sides equally. But in fact it put the Israeli government *above* the World Zionist Organisation, since all fundamental decisions of the latter could only be taken with the agreement (and often on the initiative) of the former, while the former was not obliged to consult with the latter regarding any of its policy. Furthermore, according to paragraph 7 of the Status Law, to ensure maximum cooperation and coordination between the World Zionist Organisation and the Israeli government “in accordance with the laws of the state”, it was decided to conclude a special covenant.

Thus the World Zionist Organisation-Jewish Agency recognised its subordination to the State of Israel, but at the same time

received special status within Israel (it does not, for instance, pay state taxes). After the reorganisation of the Jewish Agency in 1975, which was formally separated from the World Zionist Organisation, the Knesseth made the appropriate amendments to the Status Law.

It has already been mentioned that the departments of the World Zionist Organisation work closely with Israeli government institutions. This is hardly to be wondered at in view of the fact that before the formation of the State of Israel the World Zionist Organisation had functioned as a kind of "state within a state" in Palestine, then under mandate, while after the formation of Israel many of the Zionist departments were transformed into government ministries. It was only during the 1960s that a formal division was made between the government institutions of Israel and the "non-governmental" Zionist bodies. However, many of the departments of the World Zionist Organisation to all intents and purposes remained appendages of the various Israeli ministries. A number of agreements were signed between Israel and the World Zionist Organisation laying down conditions for the work of the latter's departments in Israel and, in effect, giving them the status of government bodies. A communique jointly issued by the Israeli government and the Executive Committee of the World Zionist Organisation on March 15, 1964 stated: "It was agreed that the effort aiming at the enhancement of the Zionist spirit in Jewish life is a matter of joint concern for the State of Israel and the World Zionist Organization."⁷⁷

Since Israelis occupy the chief posts in the Executive Committee of the World Zionist Organisation (then the chairman was Leon Dultzin) and in its General Council (at the 20th Congress Y. Peres, Deputy Minister for Industry, Trade and Tourism in Israel, was elected chairman), it is obvious that this structure allows the Israeli Zionist leaders to play a dominant role in determining the policies of international Zionism.

The Israeli government also tries to enforce its control over the "philanthropic" organisations in the Diaspora, particularly in American Jewish community. Thus all the organisations in the United States that are engaged in collecting donations for

Israel come under the "jurisdiction" of the National Committee on Control and Authorisation of Campaigns for Israel, which was set up in 1950. Formerly this committee operated under the aegis of the American section of the Jewish Agency and, after the latter's reorganisation, passed over to the American section of the World Zionist Organisation as its secretariat. The committee includes representatives from the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, the United Jewish Appeal, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, as well as the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency. As the American researcher, Daniel J. Elazar, noted, "the National Committee itself is linked with the parallel body in Israel composed of Israeli government and Jewish Agency officials at the highest".⁷⁸

After the October War of 1973 "an unprecedented agreement" was concluded between the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds and the United Jewish Appeal on the one hand and the Israeli government and the Jewish Agency on the other. According to Elazar, "this was the first time that Israel and the United Jewish Appeal formally acknowledged the interdependence of Israeli and Diaspora needs, the first time that a major emergency in Israel did not mean an abandonment or a pullback on the domestic scene in the United States. Thus the agreement marked the emergence of a new stage in the history of Israeli-Diaspora relations and of the organized life of contemporary Jewry."⁷⁹

But despite the existence of a ramified network of international Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations, the Israeli government increasingly prefers to act directly in the Jewish communities of the Diaspora without availing itself of the services of the World Zionist Organisation and other intermediate bodies. According to Walter Eytan, former parliamentary secretary of the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "it is a commonplace of our Foreign Service that every Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Israel has a dual function. He is a Minister Plenipotentiary to the country to which he is accredited—and Envoy Extraordinary to its Jews."⁸⁰ When Golda Meir was Israeli Foreign Minister, she was equally explicit, claiming that it was "part of the responsibility of Israeli diplomats and officials to remain in

permanent contact and to work closely with local Zionist organizations".⁸¹ Ben Gurion even claimed that the "Jewish public in various countries views the Israeli ambassador as their own representative".⁸² Thus a situation has come about in which the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations has become the "conduit for Israeli government decisions" and "virtually all American Jewish organisations have been willing to follow its guidelines".⁸³

Also directly connected with the Israeli government is that international system of Zionist organisations which was created to launch a campaign under the slanderous slogan of the "defence of Soviet Jews". The main objective of this campaign is to break up the unity of the multinational Soviet people, arouse nationalism among Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality and incur the animosity of the rest of the Soviet peoples towards the Jews. But at the same time the Zionists are also looking for immigrants to "open up" the occupied Arab territories. All this provocative activity is directed by the Israeli government. From 1968 to 1979 the Israeli government sent some 600,000 "appeals" to Soviet citizens, the majority of whom indignantly rejected these Zionist provocations. More recently the Zionists have tried to step up the work of their subversive centres.

In 1971 and again in 1976 a provocative "World Conference of Jewish Communities on Soviet Jewry" was called in Brussels. At both these conferences there was broad representation by the main Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations such as the World Zionist Organisation, the Jewish Agency, the World Jewish Conference, the B'nai B'rith, the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, the American Jewish Committee, and Zionist subversive centres in Western Europe and Latin America. Israel was not officially represented by a government delegation, but by the National Council in Defence of Soviet Jews. However, it comes as no great surprise that the "stars" of these gatherings were two former Israeli Prime Ministers—Ben Gurion in 1971 and Golda Meir in 1976. When it is realised that the main emphasis at these events was the demand to recognise the "right of Soviet Jews to join their brothers in the Land of Israel" and the proclamation of "the unity of the Jewish people, Soviet Jews and Israel", then it becomes clear why ruling

circles in Israel showed such interest in these anti-Soviet activities. Mention should also be made in this context of the role played by the Israeli secret services operating through the Jewish Agency and other Zionist organisations concerned with matters of immigration.

Conclusions

The ideological platform of contemporary Zionism is based on the unscientific thesis of the existence of a "special world Jewish people (nation)" whose cultural and political centre is the State of Israel. In so far as contemporary Zionism is the dominant form of Jewish bourgeois nationalism superseding all other forms of international Zionism, it is possible to speak of the international Zionist system in both the broad and the narrow sense of the term.

The international Zionist system in the narrow sense of the word includes the Jewish bourgeois-nationalist organisations that are part of the World Zionist Organisation and that accept its programme. A key role in this system is played by the international Zionist parties and the Zionist territorial federations. The system includes all the Jewish bourgeois nationalists that accept the "central position" of Israel.

The international Zionist system in the broad sense is the whole international complex of Jewish bourgeois-nationalist organisations that fully or partially accept Zionist ideology. The common denominator of all components of this system is acceptance of the Zionist idea of a "special world Jewish people" and of ties in some form or other between Israel and the Diaspora. This is a platform on which practically all the international Jewish bourgeois-nationalist organisations stand today. Such organisations include not only the World Zionist Organisation, but also the World Jewish Congress, the World Conference of Jewish Organisations, the World Conference in Defence of Soviet Jews, the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, and a number of other "world" Jewish organisations of a religious, professional, cultural, educational and philanthropic character as well as several US-based organisations which operate in other countries, like the B'nai B'rith, the American Jewish

Committee, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, the Organisation for Rehabilitation through Training, and so on. The World Zionist Organisation is not only an integral part of this complex, it also exercises considerable influence on other parts both directly, through formalised links with the World Jewish Congress and the World Conference of Jewish Organisations, and secretly, through Zionist activists operating in various "non-Zionist" organisations.

Thus the international Zionist system in the narrow sense is an alliance of official Zionists, political and "spiritual", whereas in the broad sense it is an alliance of Zionist and formally "non-Zionist" organisations on a platform of "nationalism in the Diaspora". Although the ideological differences between them have not been resolved, all Jewish bourgeois nationalists in practice take an active part in the campaigns "in defence of Israel" and "in defence of Soviet Jews". The organisational restructuring of the international Zionist system after 1967 (including the reorganisation of the Jewish Agency, the entry of the "world" Judaic unions into the World Zionist Organisation, the establishment of institutional links between the World Jewish Congress, the World Zionist Organisation and the B'nai B'rith, and the expansion of the World Conference of Jewish Organisations), although not completely doing away with the division between Zionists and "non-Zionists", nevertheless helped develop a structure for their joint or parallel action.

There are two main centres in the international Zionist system today: Israel and America. The former has at its disposal the state apparatus of Israel, where Zionism is the official ideology and policy; the latter is supported by the economic and political strength of the American Jewish big bourgeoisie, which is an integral part of the American ruling class.

On the one hand the American Zionists represent the interests of influential circles in US monopoly capitalism, while on the other they are an integral part of international Zionism. This explains the especially important role of American Zionists in the anti-Soviet campaign that runs under the false slogan of the "defence of Soviet Jews" and also their political lobbying in support of the aggressive policies of the Israeli government. It was the

American Zionists that initiated the adoption by the US Congress in 1974 of the provocative Jackson-Vanik amendment which did considerable damage to trade relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. Zionist circles in America also actively participated in the notorious "human rights" campaign which was aimed against the socialist countries, and they hold important positions in the coalition of those opposed to detente, which is headed by representatives of the US military-industrial complex. At the same time, thanks to support from other reactionary forces in the American political arena, Zionist circles have secured for Israel the role of Washington's privileged ally in the Middle East together with US massive military and economic aid to Israel.

The Israeli government is inseparably linked to the organisational and ideological complex of international Zionism. Zionism is the official ideology and political practice of the State of Israel. With the help of international Zionism a Zionist political regime has been established in Israel, whose leaders hold prominent positions in the international Zionist system. American and Israeli Zionists together control the organisational structure of contemporary Zionism and these two leading centres of international Zionism compete for the allegiance of Jewish bourgeois nationalists throughout the world. Though Israeli Zionists dominate in the World Zionist Organisation, a number of key positions in the reorganised Jewish Agency belong to the American Jewish big bourgeoisie who are also dominant in the formally "non-Zionist" Jewish bourgeois-nationalist international organisations like the World Jewish Congress and the B'nai B'rith. In the struggle for prestige and influence that goes on within this system the Israeli Zionists rely for their support on the State of Israel, while the American Jewish bourgeoisie look to their influence on the economic and political life of the United States.

The existence of an international Zionist system should not by any means be taken to mean the existence of an "extraterritorial world Jewish nation". Nor can the Jewish bourgeoisie be spoken of as a world class, for it is only in Israel that the Jewish bourgeoisie have consolidated as a class—the ruling class of that state. In other Western countries the Jewish capitalists are an integral part of the local bourgeoisie whether that be American, French,

English or whatever. Although in these countries the majority of Jewish capitalists have not been fully assimilated, their interests do not differ fundamentally from those of the local capitalists.

But at the same time the Jewish bourgeoisie in various countries has certain definite characteristics that distinguish it from other bourgeoisie. There are national characteristics, the Judaic religion and centuries of sophisticated competition, all of which have encouraged the Jewish capitalists to make use of Jewish bourgeois nationalism to defend and strengthen their positions. On the one hand, they can use it to counter progressive trends among the Jewish people and divert the Jewish working people from the struggle of the proletariat for the revolutionary restructuring of society. On the other, their control of the Jewish communities makes it possible for them to take advantage of these communities when competing with other capitalist groups.

The deep ideological and political crisis that has gripped the world imperialist system in recent years has also had a profound effect on Zionism.

The claims of the Zionists to represent the Jewish people throughout the world have clearly suffered a major setback. At the 30th Congress of the World Zionist Organisation in December 1982 it was admitted that the total membership of Zionist organisations was only 1.4 million. Even from these official figures which are clearly too high it is evident that not even 10 per cent of the 14-odd million Jews throughout the world share the Zionist programme. The congress took place in an atmosphere of disorder and mutual recrimination as a result of attempts by leaders of the various Zionist groups to blame each other for the growing isolation of Zionism in the world today. The delegates were forced to admit that immigration to Israel is continually decreasing, while emigration from Eretz Israel has been exceeding it for some years now.

The bloodshed and aggression committed by Israel in Lebanon aroused fierce indignation throughout the world. For the first time in Israel's history a massive anti-war movement sprung up during a war that had been unleashed by its rulers. More than 400,000 Israelis took part in a protest demonstration against the massacres of Palestinian refugees in the Sabra and Shatila Camps in Beirut that were committed with the full knowledge of the

Zionist leadership in Israel. For the first time acts of the Israeli government were publicly criticised by some bourgeois leaders of the Jewish communities in the United States and other capitalist countries. Former presidents of the World Jewish Congress Nahum Goldmann and Philip Klutznik openly condemned the Israeli aggression in Lebanon and called upon the government to recognise the rights of the Palestinians.

The leaders of the opposition Labour Party as well as some leaders of the Zionist lobby in the United States came out in support of the "Reagan Plan" (subsequently rejected by the Begin government) which envisaged an "association" of the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and Jordan so as to prevent the creation of an independent Palestinian state. As a result, at the 30th Congress of the World Zionist Organisation the Likud bloc could not get a sufficient number of votes to win approval for the Jewish settlement building programme on the occupied territories which was designed to prepare these territories for future annexation. The dispute over the distribution of seats at the congress resulted in the election of US delegates being postponed and many delegates not turning up to the congress at all. Of the approximate 500 participants with the right to vote only 185 represented the Likud bloc. Because the Labour Party increased its number of seats in the Israeli Knesseth at the 1981 elections, the delegation from the World Union of Labour Zionists was able to raise its representation at the 30th Congress to 145 votes. With the support of American Zionists from the World Confederation of United Zionists (a total of 95 delegates) and of representatives from various smaller groups the Labour Party won approval at the 30th Congress for a resolution that provided for what was called a "territorial compromise", that is to say, the division of the West Bank between Israel and Jordan.

After Begin's supporters had been twice defeated at the congress, Leon Dultzin, the chairman, announced a break for "consultations". He declared that the World Zionist Organisation was not entitled to refuse the support of the Israeli government and declared the resolution "null and void". This resulted in an outbreak of fighting in the conference hall.

But this internal squabbling among the Zionist leadership does not mean that international Zionism has ceased to be a dangerous

opponent of progressive forces. In a bid to extricate themselves from the crisis Zionist circles have stepped up their campaigns against the socialist countries, the international working-class movement and the national liberation movement. The ramified organisational complex of international Zionism still serves the opponents of peace and social progress.

References

1. See *Zionism*, Israel Pocket Library, Jerusalem, 1973, p. 17.
2. See *The Third Zionist Congress (Basle)*, Odessa, 1899, p. 5 (in Russian).
3. Arthur Hertzberg (Ed.), *The Zionist Idea. A Historical Analysis and Reader*, Greenwood Press Publishers, Westport, Connecticut, 1970, p. 227.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 229.
5. Walter Laqueur, *A History of Zionism*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1972, p. 106.
6. *Ibid.*
7. Alex Bein, *Theodore Herzl. A Biography*, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1945, p. 246.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 272.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 252.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 167-68.
12. Chaim Weizmann, *Trial and Error. The Autobiography*, Harper and Harper Publishers, New York, 1949, p. 128.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 213.
14. Melvin Urofsky, *American Zionism from Herzl to the Holocaust*, Anchor Press/Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1975, p. 323.
15. Chaim Weizmann, *Op. cit.*, p. 363.
16. Harry Schneiderman (Ed.), *Two Generations in Perspective. Notable Events and Trends 1896-1956*, Monde Publishers, New York, 1957, p. 169.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 180.
18. *Survey of the Activities of the Zionist Parties and WZO*, Published by the Organisation and Information Department of the Zionist Executive, Jerusalem, 1972, p. 16.

19. Walter Laqueur, *Op. cit.*, p. 353.
20. *Ibid.*, pp. 362, 368.
21. R. M. Brodsky, Y. A. Shulmeister, *Zionism—a Tool of Reaction*, Lvov, 1976, p. 54 (in Russian).
22. Maxime Rodinson, *Israel. A Colonial-Settler State?* Monad Press, New York, 1973, p. 108.
23. Walter Laqueur, *Op. cit.*, p. 95.
24. Irene L. Gendzier (Ed.), *A Middle East Reader*, Pegasus, New York, 1969, p. 101.
25. Arthur Hertzberg (Ed.), *Op. cit.*, p. 348.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 345.
27. Irene L. Gendzier (Ed.), *Op. cit.*, pp. 102, 104.
28. Arthur Hertzberg (Ed.), *Op. cit.*, p. 348.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 376.
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 379, 381.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 382.
32. Irene L. Gendzier (Ed.), *Op. cit.*, p. 110.
33. *Ibid.*
34. *Ibid.*, p. 103.
35. V. I. Lenin, "The National Question in Our Programme", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 452.
36. V. I. Lenin, "Theses on the National Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 245.
37. Arthur Hertzberg (Ed.), *Op. cit.*, p. 359.
38. V. I. Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 26.
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 410, 424.
40. Irene L. Gendzier (Ed.), *Op. cit.*, p. 210.
41. *World Marxist Review*, Vol. 20, No. 8, 1977, p. 75.
42. Arthur Hertzberg (Ed.), *Op. cit.*, p. 227.
43. *Ibid.*
44. David Ben Gurion, *Memoirs* (compiled by Thomas R. Branstetter), The World Publishing Company, New York, 1970, p. 107.
45. Arthur Hertzberg (Ed.), *Op. cit.*, p. 403.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 414.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 402.

48. *Ibid.*, p. 430.
49. *Rinascita*, 26. VIII. 1977.
50. *The Communist Party of Israel. The 19th Congress*, Tel Aviv, 1981, p. 210.
51. *Resolutions of the 29th Zionist Congress*, Jerusalem, 1978.
52. See *Resolutions of the 29th Zionist Congress*, p. 40.
53. *Ibid.*
54. See *Resolutions of the 29th Zionist Congress*.
55. *American Jewish Year Book 1980*, New York, 1979, p. 271.
56. *Reports to the 28th Zionist Congress*, Jerusalem, 1972, p. 30.
57. *Ibid.*, pp. 59, 74.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 108.
59. Stanley Feldstein, *The Land That I Show You. Three Centuries of Jewish Life in America*, Anchor Press/Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1978, pp. 260-61.
60. See Milton Goldin, *Why They Give. American Jews and Their Philanthropics*, MacMillan Publishing Co., New York, 1976, p. 214.
61. *Reports to the 28th Zionist Congress*, p. 5.
62. *Against Zionism and Israeli Aggression*, Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1974, pp. 100, 101 (in Russian).
63. See Howard M. Sachar, *A History of Israel. From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1976, p. 739.
64. See *The Zionist Year Book 1979*, London, 1979, p. 77.
65. *American Jewish Year Book 1981*, New York, 1980, pp. 298-99.
66. See *40 Years in Action. A Record of the World Jewish Congress 1936-1976*, Geneva, s.a., pp. 60-61.
67. *American Jewish Year Book 1974-75*, New York, 1974, p. 580.
68. *Ibid.*, p. 582.
69. Nahum Goldmann, *The Autobiography. Sixty Years of Jewish Life*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1969, p. 324.
70. See *The World Jewish Congress Today*, New York, 1978.
71. *The Washington Post*, February 7, 1971.
72. Nahum Goldmann, *Op. cit.*, p. 327.

- 73. *Ibid.*, p. 326.
- 74. Robert Silverberg, *If I Forget Thee, O Jerusalem: American Jews and the State of Israel*, Pyramid Books, New York, 1972, p. 486.
- 75. Joseph Badi (Ed.), *Fundamental Laws of the State of Israel*, Twayne Publishers, New York, 1961, p. 285.
- 76. *Ibid.*
- 77. *The Jerusalem Post*, March 16, 1964, p. 8.
- 78. Daniel J. Elazar, *Community and Polity. The Organizational Dynamics of American Jewry*, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1976, p. 345.
- 79. *Ibid.*, p. 347.
- 80. Walter Eytan, *The First Ten Years. A Diplomatic History of Israel*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1958, p. 119.
- 81. Abdelwahab M. Elmessiri, *The Land of Promise. A Critique of Political Zionism*, North American, Inc., New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1977, p. 33.
- 82. *Ibid.*
- 83. Daniel J. Elazar, *Op. cit.*, pp. 224-25.

A. Kryukov

THE STRATEGIC ALLIANCE IN THE INTERNATIONAL ZIONIST SYSTEM

The First Zionist Congress which was held on August 29, 1897 in Basle set itself the goal: "To create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law."¹ This was to be achieved through the setting up of a World Zionist Organisation.²

From the moment of its formation the Zionists tried to present the World Zionist Organisation as representing all Jews throughout the world. At the Basle Congress Theodor Herzl, who was the founder of the World Zionist Organisation, described it as the "agent of the Jewish people", which would negotiate on their behalf with governments.³ As president of the Organisation, Herzl had talks with Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany, King Victor-Emmanuel of Italy, the Pope, and Abdul Hamid, the Sultan of Turkey, even though the World Zionist Organisation was not recognised as a subject of international law.

In 1899 the Zionists formed the Jewish Colonial Trust and at the Fifth Zionist Congress in 1901 set up the Jewish National Fund (Keren Kayemet) in order to finance immigration to Palestine.

Their next step in the penetration of Palestine was taken at the Seventh Congress in 1907 when it was decided to form the Palestine Office. This was set up in the following year in Jaffa and was headed by Arthur Ruppin,⁴ a prominent figure in the Zionist movement of the times. Also functioning in Palestine in those days was the Palestinian Commission, whose president, Otto Warburg, was later to preside over the World Zionist Organisation. The main concern of this commission was the strengthening and expansion of Jewish agricultural settlements.

From 1904 to 1913 some 40,000 persons came to Palestine

constituting the Second Aliya or ascent into Zion (the first had taken place between 1882 and 1903).⁵ It was during this period that the majority of the future founders of the State of Israel came to Palestine including such prominent persons as David Ben Gurion, Levi Eshkol, Yitzhak Ben-Zvi, and others. The subsequent waves of Jewish immigration to Palestine took place when the country was under British mandate.

Herzl had been one of the first to recommend that the Zionists seek support from Britain,⁶ but before they could conclude an alliance with British imperialism a long period of bargaining was necessary. The British wanted the organisation of a "Jewish national home" to be as much as possible in line with their own interests as colonialists.

On November 2, 1917, after the conclusion of talks between the Zionists and the British government, the British Foreign Secretary, Arthur Balfour, sent a letter (known as the Balfour Declaration) to Lionel Walter Rothschild, the president of the British Zionist Federation, which stated: "His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object."⁷

In April 1918 the British government empowered the World Zionist Organisation to send a commission headed by Chaim Weizmann to establish contact between the leadership of the Yishuv* and the British military authorities and to increase Zionist activity within the Yishuv itself. The setting up of this commission also points to the desire on the part of the Zionists to rapidly implement their plans for Palestine even during the difficult conditions of the war which was then going on. The commission included Zionist leaders from Britain, France and Italy.

The political alliance between ruling circles in Britain and the Zionists made it possible for members of the World Zionist Organisation to participate in the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 at which the imperialists took their next step towards recognising the World Zionist Organisation as a subject of international law. On February 23, 1919, Chaim Weizmann and Menachem Ussishkin, who representing the World Zionist Organisation at

* Yishuv—the name of the Jewish community in Palestine prior to 1948.

the Conference, were invited to the Council of Ten of the Allied powers where they presented the programmes of the Zionist movement including the demand for the recognition of a "Jewish council or agency as the mouthpiece of the interests of the Jews in Palestine and the world over".⁸

The next step in the formation of the leading organ of the World Zionist Organisation in Palestine was the decision by the 12th Zionist Congress (Karlovy Vary, 1921) to replace the Zionist Commission by a Palestine Zionist Executive consisting of those members of the Executive who resided in Palestine at the time. The members of the Palestine Zionist Executive headed the various operational departments that ran the affairs of the Yishuv; authority to decide many issues was given to the Zionists by the British military administration.⁹

Parallel with the formation of a Zionist control body in Palestine the Yishuv also formed an elective self-governing body. In early 1918 a meeting of representatives of the Jewish community in Palestine was held in Jaffa, which elected a "Provisional Committee of the Jews in Palestine on the British-Occupied Territory".

On December 18, 1918, a congress of Yishuv representatives was also held in Jaffa at which the demand was voiced in particular for the "setting up of a Jewish organisation which had as its task the guidance of the entire activity relating to the settlement and development of the country [Palestine.—*Author*"]".¹⁰

But the first elected institution, the Asafat Hanifcharim (National Assembly), began to function in October 1920¹¹ as the "parliament" of the Yishuv. It elected a Va'ad Le'umi (National Council) which acted in an executive capacity and dealt with matters concerning culture and the formation of a health and social security system.¹²

During this period the Zionist Executive Committee (later the Executive Committee of the Jewish Agency) became more important and influential as can be seen from its functions and powers which comprised control of finance (including donations from the Diaspora), the organisation of immigration and the settlement of new repatriates, the right to represent the Yishuv in negotiations with the British Mandatory Government, the organisation of industrial enterprises and, from 1930 onwards, defence.

United by a common aim—the organisation of Jewish immigration to Palestine and the creation of a “world Jewish state”—the leaders of international Zionism and the Palestine Yishuv worked together from the very first.

* * *

Thanks to their alliance with ruling circles in Britain the Zionists were able to favourably influence the conditions of the British mandate in Palestine. Thus the mandate directly concerned Zionist activity providing for the creation of an “appropriate Jewish agency . . . as a public body for the purpose of advising and cooperating with the Administration of Palestine in such economic, social and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish national home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine”.¹³ According to the League of Nations mandate on Palestine, the World Zionist Organisation, “so long as its organisation and constitution are in the opinion of the Mandatory appropriate, shall be recognised as such agency”.¹⁴

On July 22, 1922, the League of Nations approved a decision to grant Britain a mandate over Palestine. Thus British imperialism profited by its deal with the Zionist bourgeoisie. According to Chaim Weizmann it was the Zionists who “gave substance and reality to the idea of a British protectorate—which afterward took the form of a mandate—over Palestine”.¹⁵

The provisions of the mandate, especially those that defined the relationship between the WZO/JA and the British authorities in Palestine, show the considerable degree of influence that the Zionists already possessed by the early 1920s in Palestine. It is interesting to note that the decision of the League of Nations to grant Great Britain a mandate over Palestine came into force on September 29, 1923, whereas the Zionist Commission had been running things in the country since April 1918. Even before the mandate came into force the British government had tried to control the Zionists in Palestine. The White Paper published in 1922 stated: “The Zionist Commission in Palestine, now termed the Palestine Zionist Executive, has not desired to possess, and does not possess, any share in the general administration of the country.”¹⁶ The mandate on Palestine (concerning the rights of

the Jewish Agency) similarly excluded the World Zionist Organisation from participation in running the country. The Jewish Agency could, according to the mandate, participate in the overall development of Palestine, but not directly in running the country. The leadership of the World Zionist Organisation was even compelled to give official confirmation to the British authorities in Palestine that it would conduct its affairs there strictly in accordance with its well-defined powers.¹⁷

And in fact for a short time the leadership of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency did abide by the conditions that determined their sphere of activity in Palestine. But as the number of Jewish military units grew and with them the political influence of the Zionists, the leadership of the WZO and the JA in Palestine began to exceed their powers as set out in the mandate and no longer fulfilled their obligations to the British government.

In order to use the broad masses of the Jewish people for their own ends, most of whom had tried to avoid involvement with Zionism, Chaim Weizmann (chairman of the World Zionist Organisation from 1920 to 1931) and the other Zionist leaders decided to set up a "non-Zionist" Jewish Agency for Palestine. Their main objective, of course, was to get the American Jewish bourgeoisie with their enormous financial resources to participate in the Jewish Agency.¹⁸

The decision for the setting up of this Jewish Agency was taken at the 13th Zionist Congress, which was held at Karlovy Vary in 1923, and its official status was confirmed at the 16th Zionist Congress in Zurich in August 1929. But by this time it was already functioning, selecting emigrants for Palestine, involving itself in the affairs of the urban authorities, setting up youth camps and even collecting taxes, purchasing land through the Jewish National Fund and setting up agricultural settlements through the Palestine Foundation Fund. The World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency even formed their own "security department", a secret Zionist intelligence and counter-espionage service that was headed by Chaim Herzog (subsequently the head of Israeli Military Intelligence). This department had close links with the secret services of Great Britain and the United States. It carried out espionage and subversion in Palestine and,

in particular, trained Zionist terrorists for carrying out attacks on the Arab population. It was the security department of the World Zionist Organisation that subsequently gave birth to the infamous Israeli intelligence service, the Mossad. Under the British mandate over Palestine the Mossad was involved, apart from other things, in conducting the illicit immigration of Jews into Palestine, to which end it set up a ramified network in Europe. The Mossad was also required to maintain links between the leaders of the Yishuv and the European Zionist organisations.¹⁹

The World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency took part in the formation of the Haganah, the semi-legal armed forces of the Yishuv, which were founded in 1920 to combat the local Arab population. Subsequently the Haganah became the basis for the armed forces of the State of Israel.

In 1921 the Chief Rabbinate, the highest religious body of the Jewish community in Palestine, was also set up with the help of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency. Thus the Jewish Agency was clearly envisaged by the leaders of international Zionism as a Zionist quasi-government in Palestine.

The report of the British Royal Commission (1937) that was headed by Lord Robert Peel and sent to Palestine to study the local situation described the Jewish Agency as a "powerful and effective organisation" which "amounts, in fact, to a Government existing side by side with the Mandatory Government".²⁰ It is interesting to note that even before the formation of the State of Israel the Jewish Agency was registered in the United States in accordance with the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 as an "agent of a foreign state".²¹

The joint Anglo-American Committee that was formed to study the situation in Palestine after the Second World War noted in 1946 that "at first the Agency gave the Palestine Government effective cooperation. With its large revenue, its able administrators, advisers and staff, and its manifold activities, the Agency became . . . the most potent non-governmental authority in Palestine and indeed in the Middle East."²²

So long as the World Zionist Organisation was dependent upon the British government it pursued a policy for the formation of a "Jewish national home", while remaining under the formal control of Great Britain. But in the late 1930s and particularly after the

outbreak of the Second World War the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency not only removed themselves from British control, but even entered into open conflict with the British government, a conflict which became particularly acute over the question of limiting Jewish immigration to Palestine. Those limitations on the activity of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency, which had been set out in the Balfour Declaration and under the mandate, were now forgotten. At the 21st Zionist Congress, held in Geneva in August 1939, David Ben Gurion put forward a programme according to which the Yishuv and the Zionist movement should not only cease their cooperation with the British government, but actively resist attempts from the British Mandatory Government in Palestine to reduce the influence of the Zionists in that country.²³

During the early 1940s the Zionists reoriented their policy, making the United States their main partner in the achievement of their goals. The Zionist bourgeoisie became convinced that "Britain could no longer be relied upon, and that it was expedient to seek the support of the United States".²⁴

In May 1942 some 600 delegates from Zionist organisations in Palestine, Europe and the United States held a meeting in New York at which they adopted the Biltmore Programme. This programme which expressed the demands of the World Zionist Organisation leaders, the representatives of the Palestinian Zionists and the leaders of the American Zionist organisations called for the establishment of a "Jewish State" in Palestine. It envisaged the formation of a Jewish army fighting under its own flag, the end of all limitations imposed upon Jewish immigration to Palestine, which was now to be placed under the control of the Jewish Agency, and the granting to the latter of full powers to ensure the development of agriculture and industry in Palestine through the organisation of mass Jewish immigration and through the settlement and farming of the "unoccupied" lands.²⁵

After the Second World War Zionism finally freed itself from subordination to British imperialism, although to this day the Zionists continue to cooperate with it. The centre for the activity of international Zionism was transferred from London to New York not only for political reasons—the fact that the United

States had become the leading imperialist power, which in fact drove the Zionists to seek its patronage and offer it their services—but also for economic considerations.

At the 22nd Zionist Congress in Basle (December 1946) David Ben Gurion made a “coup” within the World Zionist Organisation by unseating Chaim Weizmann as chairman of the Organisation, a post he had held for more than 20 years, during which time he had tended to rely on Great Britain. Ben Gurion was elected chairman of the Executive Committee of the World Zionist Organisation and a year and a half later took over the reins of government of the newly formed State of Israel, giving the veteran Zionist Weizmann the honorary office of President.

Until the State of Israel was proclaimed the Zionists acted in the United Nations through the Jewish Agency. The height of their activity was reached in 1947 and 1948.²⁶ Despite the objections of the British government the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency raised the question of the problems facing the “Jewish people” before the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations.

The leading representative of the Jewish Agency at the United Nations at the time was Moshe Sharett. Already a prominent Zionist leader, Sharett began his career as an interpreter with the commanding officer of the German army in Turkey. After the First World War he worked as the head of one of the departments in the Zionist Commission. In 1931 Sharett became secretary of the political department of the Jewish Agency in Palestine and in 1933 he became head of the department after the death of Chaim Arlosoroff who had headed it for several years. At the same time Sharett was invited to join the Zionist Executive where he remained a member until 1946.

The appointment of Sharett, a Zionist politician with considerable experience in international affairs, to the post of first Foreign Minister in the new Israeli government was only to be expected. In 1953 he became Prime Minister of Israel until 1955. Throughout his political career he held various leading posts in the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency and in the Israeli government, his final post being that of chairman of the Executive Committee of the Jewish Agency (1960-1965).²⁷

The end of the British mandate over Palestine and the proclamation of the State of Israel on May 14, 1948 meant that the Jewish Agency ceased to function as an institution whose main objective was promoting the formation of a Jewish State in Palestine. In what was called the "Declaration of Independence" the leaders of the Zionist movement and the Israeli rulers already speak with one voice: "We, the members of the National Council, representing the Jewish people in Palestine and the Zionist movement of the world . . . hereby proclaim the establishment of the Jewish State in Palestine."²⁸ The Israeli government was made up of prominent Zionists, members of the Va'ad Le'umi (the leading body of the Yishuv) and of the Executive Committee of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency. The decision for this was taken by the Executive Committee of the Jewish Agency and the Va'ad Le'umi.²⁹ Some departments of the Jewish Agency ceased to exist since their functions were superseded by the state, others evolved directly into ministries. Thus, for example, the political department of the Jewish Agency became the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the social welfare department became the Ministry of Social Welfare. The Haganah became the Israeli army. In general the formation of the State of Israel meant that "many officials simply moved their files from the Jewish Agency, the Histadrut, the Anglo-Palestine Bank, and other organisations, to their new desks".³⁰

Certain functions, such as organising the immigration and re-settlement of Olim (Jews) from abroad, were carried out by the Jewish Agency and the state institutions in parallel. The official aim of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency was proclaimed as strengthening of the State of Israel and gathering Jews to the land of this state so as to ensure the "unity of the Jewish people".³¹

Although the proclamation of the State of Israel meant that the main objectives of the World Zionist Organisation had been achieved, the leaders of the international Zionist movement and the Israeli government knew only too well that when it came to winning support for the new state and organising Jewish immigration to Israel, the WZO and the JA were irreplaceable.

The first attempt (after the formation of the State of Israel)

to determine the status of the WZO/JA was made at the 23rd Zionist Congress in 1951, one of the resolutions of which stated that the Zionist movement recognised that prerogatives formerly belonging to the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency had now been transferred to the state.

Another resolution passed at the 23rd Congress and entitled "The Status of the World Zionist Organisation" declared that "fulfilment of its historic task in Eretz Israel calls for the fullest degree of cooperation and coordination on its part with the State of Israel and its Government". The resolution went on: "The State of Israel shall grant, through an appropriate legislative act, status to the World Zionist Organisation as the representative of the Jewish people in all matters relating to organised participation of the Jews of the Diaspora in the development and upbuilding of the country and the rapid absorption of the immigrants". Then the resolution listed the functions which the WZO and the JA should fulfil. These were as follows:

- a. organising immigration and providing passage for Jewish immigrants and their belongings to Eretz Israel;
- b. organising resettlement;
- c. encouraging the youth Aliya;
- d. developing agricultural settlements;
- e. purchasing land through the Jewish National Fund;
- f. participating in development projects.

The resolution also pointed to the need to set up a commission to coordinate the work of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency, on the one hand, and the Israeli government, on the other, in the above-said areas.³²

The resolution showed that from the moment that the British mandate over Palestine ceased to be effective, the juridical status of the WZO/JA also ceased to exist. The Zionist leaders realised that this status ought to be determined by Israeli legislation, but they were reluctant for the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency to be defined as representing the State of Israel only. Accordingly they tried to get the WZO/JA recognised by the State of Israel and given the simultaneous status as "representative of the Jewish people", i.e., to win recognition for these organisations not only by Jews in Israel, but by all Jews throughout the world.

For its part the Israeli government was no less interested in granting juridical status to the WZO/JA as its closest ally. Thus in 1952 a speech in the Knesseth on a draft bill concerning the status of the WZO, Prime Minister David Ben Gurion declared that "the Zionist Organisation has not been rendered useless by the establishment of the State, but, on the contrary, its responsibility and mission have become incalculably greater. The State and the Zionist Movement complement each other, need each other and with joint effort can and must activate the Jewish people to realize the ideal of its redemption."³³

To justify the virtual absence of a constitution in Israel its rulers refer to what they call the "fundamental laws" that determine the structure of the state, immigration regulations, etc. These "fundamental laws" include the "World Zionist Organisation-Jewish Agency Status Law, 5713-1952", which was adopted on November 24, 1952 and came into force on December 2 of the same year. Ben Gurion described it in the Knesseth as "one of the foremost basic laws".³⁴

According to the Law the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency are considered as an integral body represented in Israel by the Zionist Executive Committee (the Executive Committee of the Jewish Agency).³⁵ Article 4 of the Law describes the World Zionist Organisation as "the authorised agency which will continue to operate in the State of Israel for the development and settlement of the country, the absorption of immigrants from the Diaspora and the coordination of the activities in Israel of Jewish institutions and organisations active in those fields".³⁶ Thus the leaders of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency were given full powers in all areas of their activity, the rights to which they declared at the 23rd Congress. The Israeli rulers—Chaim Weizmann, David Ben Gurion, Moshe Sharett, Golda Meir, Levi Eshkol and others, who had recently been leaders of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency—accorded international Zionism in the person of its leading organisation broad powers in Israel and at the same time arbitrarily accorded the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency the right to speak beyond the borders of Israel in the name of the "Jewish people" as a whole.

The status of the Executive Committee of the World Zionist

Organisation and the Jewish Agency is such that it "may enter into contacts, acquire, hold and relinquish property and be a party to any legal or other proceeding".³⁷ The Executive Committee, its funds and other institutions were freed from having to pay taxes and other payments to the state, which shows that it and its branches fulfilled functions which would otherwise have been the province of the government. In this sense the Zionist Executive Committee was equated with a government organ.

The necessity for "full cooperation and coordination" of action between the leading international Zionist organisations and the ruling clique in Israel was due to "the mission of gathering in the exiles, which is the central task of the State of Israel and the Zionist Movement in our days", as stressed in the Law on the Status of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency.

The section of the Law dealing with the legal aspect of relations between Israel and the WZO/JA stated that "the form of its [the Zionist Executive's.—*Author.*] cooperation with the Government shall be determined by a Covenant to be made in Israel between the Government and the Zionist Executive".³⁸

The above-mentioned Covenant, which was signed in 1954, has become the final endorsement of the close and mutual, in terms of their identity of interests, aims and methods, cooperation between the Zionist movement in the person of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency and ruling circles in Israel in the person of its government. The provisions of the Covenant are essentially a repetition of the Law on the Status of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency with due regard for the fact that the Executive Committee of the WZO/JA is the authorised representative of the Zionist movement in Israel.

In the same year of 1954 the Israeli government accorded the Jewish Agency and its departments and organisations the status of government institutions.³⁹

Since the World Zionist Organisation, the Jewish Agency and the Israeli government were in the hands of the same Zionist political elite, they cooperated closely. In the Zionist Executive Committee report to the 24th Zionist Congress (1956) it is stated, among other things, that one of the matters put before Maurice Boukstein, the legal adviser to the Jewish Agency who was at

the same time an attorney in the New York office of the United Jewish Appeal, was the preparation of a draft Law on the Status of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency and negotiations with the Israeli government on an agreement between it and the WZO. Boukstein stated in his report that on both the first and the second issue "much . . . work was done in close cooperation with the Legal Adviser to the Government of Israel".⁴⁰

The Covenant which was signed both by the leaders of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency, on the one hand, and the Israeli rulers, on the other, contained a special point devoted to the setting up of a Coordinating Committee which, in fact, already existed. The formation of the "Government and Jewish Agency Coordinating Committee", which contained four government and four Jewish Agency representatives and one representative from the Jewish National Fund, was announced in May 1950 by Prime Minister David Ben Gurion. Its tasks included "defining the relationship between the World Zionist Organisation and the government on the basis of business-like contacts [between the leadership of the WZO/JA and the leaders of the Yishuv.—*Author.*] which were formed before the foundation of the State of Israel".⁴¹ Later this relationship was given legislative endorsement. Thus the 1954 Covenant was only formal affirmation of the existence of the above-mentioned committee. The Prime Minister unfailingly participated in all its meetings, which were called once a month. It was here that Israel's financial needs were set out, its requirement for more manpower from the Diaspora drawn up, its "tax payments" from Jews throughout the world determined, and plans for pressurising one government or another or conducting anti-Soviet activity drawn up.

To further raise the prestige and importance of the Zionist leaders, the Israeli government passed an official resolution to the effect that at all ceremonies and events the chairman of the Executive Committee and the chairman of the General Council of the WZO/JA would enter immediately after the members of the Israeli government, and the members of the Executive Committee were to be considered equal in representative rank to Knesseth deputies; members of the General Council were to im-

mediately follow Knesseth deputies.⁴² All these actions on the part of the Israeli rulers show that they consider the Zionist leaders to be an integral part of the government.

But the formation of the Coordinating Committee was not the last link in the chain of joint institutions that stretched between international Zionism and ruling circles in the State of Israel. In 1958 the Coordinating Committee itself set up a committee to "review the immigration regulations", which included the Ministers of Health and Labour and the heads of the immigration and absorption departments of the Jewish Agency. A subcommittee with similar objectives was also set up, consisting of the general directors of the same ministries and departments. Both the committee and subcommittee draw up a number of projects, including the cynical recommendations to increase the immigrant work force, while reducing the number of immigrants of pensionable age and restricting the entry of those unable to work.⁴³

It is interesting to note in passing that before the above-mentioned committee and subcommittee had been formed the leaders of the WZO/JA developed close contacts with Israeli diplomatic and consular representatives abroad so as to pursue a more effective policy of enticing the Jews to immigrate to Israel from all over the world. This did not present any great difficulties for the Zionists in so far as the Israeli Foreign Minister for the period (1948-1956) was Moshe Sharett. The report of the Zionist Executive Committee notes: "We [the leaders of the WZO/Ja.-*Author.*] note with great satisfaction the fullest cooperation in the field of immigration between our offices and the Israeli Consulates in the United States and Canada."⁴⁴ According to a decision of the Coordinating Committee, a procedure was established whereby all applications from those desiring to emigrate to Israel sent to Israeli consulates in various countries of the world were immediately transferred to the immigration department of the Jewish Agency for consideration.

In November 1959 the Knesseth reaffirmed the loyalty of the Israeli government to its alliance with the WZO/JA in a specially adopted declaration. It stated, in particular, that the Israeli government would give its support to the Zionist movement and promote the achievement of the objectives facing it, the most important of which were: increasing voluntary financial donations,

organising the immigration of youth and children, encouraging capital investment in Israel, strengthening the country's international position and supporting Israel in war.

And in their turn the international Zionist organisations, particularly the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency, were loyal allies to the State of Israel. One of their main objectives was overt or covert support for the aggressive foreign policy of the Israeli leaders and the encouragement of favourite public opinion towards Israel throughout the world. The WZO/JA leaders spared no expense from their funds donated by Jews in the West when it came to promoting pro-Israeli propaganda campaigns of this kind.

Thus "in 1963 a Senate Foreign Relations Committee investigation of the American Zionist Council (a coordinating body for a number of Zionist organizations) found that it was acting as a 'conduit' for the Jewish Agency, having received over an eight-year period more than \$5 million for the purpose of creating favourable public opinion toward the Israeli government's foreign policy".⁴⁵

The WZO/JA and the Israeli leaders have close financial connections. A considerable part of the resources collected through the Jewish Agency go directly to the Israeli government which uses them to its own ends, particularly the purchase of large amounts of arms abroad.

The Jewish Agency transfers large sums of money to Israeli political parties and to various Zionist organisations under its control. According to Uri Avnery, an Israeli liberal journalist, "by financing youth organisations, educational activities, propaganda agencies, and other institutions belonging to the Zionist parties, the Jewish Agency goes a long way toward sustaining the huge apparatus every Zionist party maintains in Israel and abroad".⁴⁶

At a regular meeting in March 1964 between representatives of the Israeli government and the Executive Committee of the WZO/JA it was confirmed that the functions of the leading Zionist organisation included immigration, absorption and settlement as provided for under the Covenant, together with child and youth education in the Diaspora and active participation in the work of the Jewish communities and the Jewish international or-

ganisations. At this meeting ruling circles of Israel expressed their satisfaction with the leadership of the WZO/JA, and Prime Minister Levi Eshkol stated on behalf of the Israeli government his agreement with the Executive Committee's action programme. The Israeli government expressed a lively interest in the plans of the Zionist Executive Committee for various countries of the world as well as its readiness to give support to their implementation.

In 1965 the Jewish National Fund also concluded an official agreement on cooperation with the Israeli government.

On January 30, 1967, the Coordinating Committee under the chairmanship of Levi Eshkol—a no less famous Zionist activist than the two previous Israeli Prime Ministers, Ben Gurion and Sharett, and who between 1949 and 1952 had held the posts of head of the political department and the treasury of the Jewish Agency—approved a decision to set up yet another joint government-Jewish Agency body—the Authority on Immigration and Absorption. The aim of the Authority, it was reported, was to encourage immigration and improve absorption by providing a single address for the immigrant, which would deal with all his problems.⁴⁷ The Authority was made up of four ministers and four members of the Executive Committee of the JA. It was headed by the chairman of the Executive Committee of the Jewish Agency with the Minister of Labour as his deputy.⁴⁸

An assessment of the importance of the Coordinating Committee in achieving the joint aims of international Zionism and the Israeli leadership was given by Moshe Sharett, who was well-qualified to do so, since through the post he had held in the Zionist political elite he had been able to work on the Coordinating Committee both as chairman of the Jewish Agency and as a member of the Israeli government. In 1954 Sharett, then head of the Cabinet, signed the Covenant between the Israeli government and the WZO/JA Executive Committee. Later, in 1963, now chairman of the WZO/JA Executive Committee, he declared in a speech to a session of the General Council of the WZO/JA that "the resolutions [of the Coordinating Committee.—*Author.*] are faithfully respected and when there is any matter liable to cause complications . . . the Government always calls upon us to study the question. When we call upon the Government, there

is always a response. A network of sub-committees of the Coordinating Committee has proliferated dealing with all sorts of questions."⁴⁹

The need for strategic cooperation between the leading international Zionist organisations and government circles in Israel was frequently referred to by Nahum Goldmann, the president of the World Zionist Organisation. Thus in a speech in January 1966 which was largely devoted to the 1954 Covenant he said: "We have entered into a Covenant and are performing many tasks which in other countries are performed by Governments. The Covenant accordingly reflects an abnormal situation; but the situation in the State of Israel is still abnormal and the majority of the Jewish people still live outside the borders of the State, and there is need of a movement [i.e., a Zionist movement. -*Author.*] bringing thousands and tens of thousands of Jews to the State. This was the reason for the Covenant. At the same time it is clear that all this—settlement, absorption and immigration—can only be carried on in cooperation with the State."⁵⁰

Thus by the mid-1960s the strategic alliance between the leading international Zionist organisations and ruling circles in Israel, an alliance which had virtually been concluded before the formation of the Zionist state, had been completed. During the years immediately following the proclamation of the State of Israel, the alliance between its rulers and the leaders of the WZO/JA was considerably strengthened. This is explained by the identity of strategic interests on both sides as well as by the fact that "when Israel became independent, the top echelons of its political elite already had more than two decades of trial and error in self-government; and the top leaders continued to dominate the political scene for another two decades".⁵¹

This was noted by American observer Don Peretz, who wrote: "Israel's first four Prime Ministers, most of its cabinet members during the first generation, and a large number of its top officials, party leaders, and members of parliament received their experience in the politics of the pre-state Yishuv and in the Zionist movement."⁵²

* * *

In the period which followed the so-called "Six Day War"

during which Israel waged an aggressive campaign against the Arab countries in June 1967, the Zionist leadership tried to find a way out of the difficult economic and socio-political situation in the country and this led to a stepping up of activity on the part of the Zionists. The powerful Israeli and international Zionist propaganda apparatus glorified the "victory" of Israeli arms and at the same time tried to get more immigrants to come to Israel. Financial donations rose considerably as the Jews of the Diaspora were induced to give generously, and the prestige of the Jewish Agency and its chairman rose accordingly. The leaders of Israel at that time—Golda Meir, Pinchas Sapir, Abba Eban and others—frequently appealed to the Jewish organisations in the Diaspora through the mediation of the chairman of the Executive Committee of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency, Arye Abraham Pincus. Like his predecessors in the post, Pincus was a characteristic example of the tight connections between the international Zionist leadership and the Israeli government, for even while he remained at his post in the Jewish Agency he was appointed chairman of the board of directors of the National Bank of Israel (Le'umi Bank), one of the most important posts in the Israeli economic system.

Ben Gurion's successors as Prime Minister reaffirmed the policy he had initiated of orientation towards the United States. The line was also supported by Golda Meir who was Ben Gurion's pupil and successor in foreign policy.

Golda Meir joined the leadership of the World Zionist Organisation in 1946. Some time before the creation of the State of Israel she was in charge of the political department of the Jewish Agency. She frequently visited the United States and Great Britain to maintain contacts with the Jewish communities, the Zionists and various other reactionary politicians. It was therefore natural that Golda Meir should change from the Zionist elite to the ruling clique of the State of Israel. In May 1948 she joined the Provisional State Council of Israel (a temporary legislative body) and in 1949 was elected to the Knesseth. From 1950 to 1956 she was Minister of Labour and Social Security in the Ben Gurion government and from 1956 until 1966, Minister of Foreign Affairs under both the Ben Gurion and Eshkol administrations. From 1969 until 1974 Golda Meir was Prime Minister.

One of the measures adopted by the Zionist leadership to strengthen the Jewish Agency was the introduction in 1966 (analogous to the Israeli ministries) of the post of general director to which Moshe Rivlin was appointed. Until this appointment Rivlin had been Israeli Consul in New York and from 1958, general secretary of the Jewish Agency.

The work of the two heads of the Jewish Agency—the chairman of the board and the general director—was similar to that of the heads of a ministry: the general director was responsible for the practical activity of the Jewish Agency and was subordinate to the chairman of the Jewish Agency board (the minister) who set down the overall guidelines for the Agency's activity. The Pincus-Rivlin "tandem" had two main concerns—the former was concerned with the Jews of the Diaspora, and the latter with contacts with the Israeli rulers.

In 1971 relations between the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency for Israel were reorganised with a view to "improving" their work and systematising the collection of donations for Israel, particularly in the light of the fact that after the Israeli war of aggression in 1967 these donations had increased considerably. As a result of the 1971 reorganisation the WZO was given separate functions from the Jewish Agency. It was now to "continue as the organ of the Zionist movement for the fulfilment of Zionist programs and ideals"⁵³ largely among the Jews of the Diaspora.

The Jewish Agency was to be responsible for coordinating financial resources, financing and controlling immigration and resettlement, aiding the new immigrants to Israel and organising the social security, education and upbringing of the youth. In all these areas the Jewish Agency worked in close contact with the Jewish National Fund and the appropriate Israeli ministries.

The WZO/JA and the ruling Zionist circles in Israel drew up and implemented numerous plans for annexing the occupied Arab territories and making them Jewish. Thus in August 1973 the Jewish Agency with the approval of the Israeli government published a "Proposal for a General Development Programme in the Galilee Hills" which squarely stated that the Jewish population in some parts of the Galilee (the northern part of Israel), where the majority of the inhabitants are comprised of Arabs,

was "too low". This "proposal" cynically called for driving the Arab population out of this territory and converting it "into a region with a large Jewish population and drawing power (for Jews)".⁵⁴

The Jewish Agency collects financial donations for Israel through the United Jewish Appeal in the United States and the Keren Hayesod in the West. These donations are vitally essential for the State of Israel and for this reason in the 1970s an even closer union took place between the WZO/JA apparatus and the Israeli governmental institutions. Nahum Goldmann, the former president of the WZO/JA, declared that the Agency was "not a politically independent agency" and admitted that "the organisation had become totally reliant on the State of Israel for the formulation of its political policy".⁵⁵ On the other hand, the WZO/JA now plays so important a role in the life of the country that it has acquired a "state character".⁵⁶

The WZO/JA functions in Israel as the owner and shareholder of a number of the largest industrial, transport and trade companies. Control over approximately 60 companies which are completely or partially owned by the WZO/JA is in the hands of the Jewish Agency Companies Authority. It appoints its representatives on the boards of these companies and directs and controls their activity. Among the largest of these are the Jewish Colonial Trust, the Israel Land Development Company, El Al Airlines, Mekorot, Rassco, Diyul Laoleh, Itzur Ve-Pituah, and a number of other companies.⁵⁷ Even today there are frequent instances of prominent Zionist politicians joining the Israeli elite. Take, for example, the political career of Itzhak Navon. As a prominent member of the Labour Party and the Knesseth, he became chairman of the General Council of the WZO/JA in the mid-1970s. Before the 29th Congress of the WZO he offered himself for election as chairman of the Zionist Executive Committee, but Arye Leon Dultzin was thought to have better chances as he was the ally of Menachem Begin in the Likud bloc that had come to power in Israel in May 1977. As a result, in December 1977 Itzhak Navon was forced to withdraw his candidature and, like Chaim Weizmann before him, be satisfied with the honorary position of President of the State of Israel.

After the extreme right-wing Likud bloc had come to power

in Israel Begin tied the Israeli government even more closely to the international Zionist organisations. He tried to step up the work of the Coordinating Committee and increase its membership. From the government it included heads of the following main Israeli ministries: the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Finances, the Ministry of Absorption, the Ministry of Agriculture, and the Ministry of Health. The sessions of the Coordinating Committee took place under the chairmanship of Menachem Begin himself.

Together with the WZO/JA leaders the Begin government tried to halt or at least delay the development of such undesirable (for Israel) processes as the increasing scale of Jewish emigration from Israel and the decreasing immigration of Jews to Israel, caused largely through Jewish disillusion with the country. These are questions on which the Israeli Zionists and the WZO/JA leaders hold identical views, particularly in their meetings with the leaders of the Joint and the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society which are held in an attempt to get these two organisations to refuse or at any rate reduce the amount of aid they provide to Jewish émigrés going to countries (mainly the United States) other than Israel.⁵⁸

The Israeli rulers and the leading organisations in the international Zionist system jointly draw up and implement annexationist plans designed to strengthen Israel's domination over the occupied Arab territories. Thus in November 1981 the co-chairman of the JA settlement department, Matityahu Drobless, put forward a draft project for increasing the number of Jewish colonists on the West Bank over a period of four years from 20 to 100 thousand. Similar plans were also drawn up by the World Zionist Organisation and in April 1982 it became known that an analogous plan had been put forward jointly by the Israeli Ministry of Defence and the Jewish Agency development department.⁵⁹

The WZO/JA gives political and financial support to practically all the foreign policy actions of the ruling clique. It welcomed the signing of the separate Egyptian-Israeli "peace" treaty, which was concluded under the patronage of US President Carter. It supported the decisions of the Israeli leaders on the annexation of East Jerusalem, the occupied Golan Heights and the

barbaric aggression committed by Israel in Lebanon in 1982 even though all these actions run counter to international law.

After the Begin-Sharon fascist-minded clique had launched a war of destruction against the Palestinian and the Lebanese people, which the Israelis cynically referred to as "Peace for Galilee", the WZO/JA began immediately gathering additional donations for Israel, thereby giving its full support to the criminal actions of the Israeli leadership.

* * *

From the moment of its formation the World Zionist Organisation acted in the interests of the Jewish nationalist bourgeoisie, whose aim was to infiltrate and strengthen itself in Palestine and use to this end the colonialist ambitions of Great Britain and then the United States. In mandated Palestine the leaders of the World Zionist Organisation formed an alliance with the leaders of the Yishuv. Thus the Zionists laid the foundations of the future state institutions of Israel, from the country's armed forces and intelligence agencies to the organisation of its health and education systems.

The formation of the Jewish Agency for Palestine (and later for Israel) was aimed at drawing the broad masses of the Jewish population in different countries throughout the world into the Zionist political movement. After the proclamation of the State of Israel the alliance between the leading international Zionist organisation and ruling circles in Israel was given legislative endorsement.

"It is the Zionist Organization," declared David Ben Gurion, "... which is able to achieve what is beyond the power and competence of the State."⁶⁰ The president of the World Zionist Organisation, Nahum Goldmann, was more candid when he said: "It was a myth, anyway, to assume that Israel could be developed by Israelis alone; Israel would always be 'hopelessly dependent on world Jewry for economic sustenance'."⁶¹

The WZO/JA is simultaneously a part of the Israeli government and the leading organ of international Zionism. This peculiarity was noted as early as 1956 by the US correspondent, Moses Lasky, who stressed that "from a 'recognized public instrument in the Administration of Palestine' under the Mandatory, it be-

came an organ of the State of Israel".⁶² A peculiarity of the functioning of the World Zionist Organisation is the utilisation of its status as an international non-governmental organisation for the purposes of developing and upbuilding the State of Israel in the way in which these objectives are understood by the ruling Zionist circles. This can be seen, in particular, in the merging of the WZO/JA bureaucratic apparatus with the Israeli government apparatus. This interweaving of the organisational structures and functions of the WZO/JA and the Israeli state apparatus is in line with the Zionist idea of Israel as a "state of Jews of the whole world".

Thus a highly individual and fairly complex mechanism has been created and continues to function: in relation to the Jews of the Diaspora the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency act as a kind of independent, almost supra-state institution; in relation to the state of Israel, however, they are subject to the laws of that country and to the provisions of the 1954 Covenant.

This Covenant which was signed by the Israeli government and the Executive Committee of the WZO/JA is a document which proclaims the action programme of the Zionist political elite, a group from whom both the leadership of the WZO/JA and the ruling clique in Israel are formed.

There are no fundamental differences between the WZO/JA and the Israeli government over questions of Zionist activity, a fact that is once again confirmed by a statement from the chairman of the commission formed to draw up the Law on the Status of the WZO/JA, who said that during the period of preparation of the Law and the Covenant "the Government of Israel had accepted most of the amendments proposed by the Jewish Agency".⁶³

Many of the leaders of the WZO/JA who began their political careers in the Palestine Yishuv during the period of the British mandatory, people like Chaim Weizmann, David Ben Gurion, Golda Meir and Moshe Sharett, naturally took over the highest posts in the country after the formation of the State of Israel in 1948. This movement was only to be expected, for, as W. T. Mallison, an American observer, noted, "the State and the Organisation are controlled by the same political elite".⁶⁴

Thus the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency represent a reactionary alliance between the Israeli Zionist ruling clique and the Zionist leaders outside Israel.

References

1. Paul R. Mendes-Flohr and Jehuda Reinharz (Eds.), *The Jew in the Modern World. A Documentary History*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, 1980, p. 429.
2. The official title the "World Zionist Organisation" was approved in 1960; already in 1952, however, in the Status Law the Zionist Organisation was referred to as "World", while some authors had begun to use the name WZO even earlier. See Raphael Patai and Herzl Press (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel*, New York, Vol. 11, 1971, p. 1235 (hereafter as EZI without reference to the number of a volume, since the pages of the two volumes are numbered consecutively); see also Richard F. Nyrop (Ed.), *Israel. A Country Study*, Washington, 1976, p. 27.
3. Arthur Hertzberg (Ed.), *The Zionist Idea. A Historical Analysis and Reader*, Greenwood Press Publishers, Westport, Connecticut, 1970, p. 230.
4. See *The Jerusalem Quarterly*, No. 14, 1980, p. 56.
5. See EZI, p. 538.
6. See Nahum Sokolov, *History of Zionism 1600-1918*, in two volumes, Vol. I, Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1919, p. 293.
7. David Hirst, *The Gun and the Olive Branch. The Roots of Violence in the Middle East*, Future Publications, London, 1977, p. 38.
8. S. Ettinger (Ed.), *Essays on the History of the Jewish People*, Tel Aviv, 1972, p. 667 (Russian translation).
9. See Noah Lucas, *The Modern History of Israel*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1975, p. 104; EZI, pp. 1271-72.
10. S. Ettinger (Ed.), *Op. cit.*, p. 666.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 667.
12. Don Peretz, *The Government and Politics of Israel*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, 1979, pp. 41-42.

13. Paul R. Mendes-Flohr and Jehuda Reinharz (Eds.), *Op. cit.*, p. 461.
14. *Ibid.*
15. Chaim Weizmann, *Trial and Error. The Autobiography*, Harper and Harper Publishers, New York, 1949, p. 192.
16. W. T. Mallison, Jr., *The Legal Problems Concerning the Juridical Status and Political Activities of the Zionist Organisation/Jewish Agency: A Study of International and U. S. Law*, The Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut, 1968, p. 22.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
18. Noah Lucas, *Op. cit.*, p. 105.
19. See *Middle East*, London, December 1981.
20. *EZI*, p. 613.
21. *Témoignage Chrétien*, 21. I. 1971.
22. W. T. Mallison, Jr., *Op. cit.*, p. 23.
23. See S. Ettinger (Ed.), *Op. cit.*, pp. 693-94.
24. George Lenczowski, *The Middle East in World Affairs*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 1956, p. 327.
25. See David Hirst, *Op. cit.*, p. 111.
26. See W. T. Mallison, Jr., *Op. cit.*, p. 24.
27. See *EZI*, pp. 1022-23.
28. Paul R. Mendes-Flohr and Jehuda Reinharz (Eds.), *Op. cit.*, p. 478.
29. See Charles S. Liebman, *Pressure Without Sanctions. The Influence of World Jewry on Israeli Policy*, Associated University Presses, London, 1977, p. 134; R. Hrair Dekmejian, *Patterns of Political Leadership. Egypt, Israel, Lebanon*, State University of New York Press, New York, 1975, p. 124.
30. Howard M. Sachar, *The Course of Modern Jewish History. A Delta Book*, Dell Publishing Co., Inc., New York, 1963, 543.
31. W. T. Mallison, *Op. cit.*, p. 36.
32. *Ibid.*, pp. 29-30.
33. *Jewish Agency Digest of Press and Events*, Jerusalem, May 16, 1952, pp. 1069-70.
34. *Israel Government Year Book*, Jerusalem, 1952, p. 57.

35. Joseph Badi (Ed.), *Fundamental Laws of the State of Israel*, Twayne Publishers, New York, 1961, pp. 285, 286.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 285.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 286.
38. *Ibid.*
39. *Session of the Zionist General Council*, Jerusalem, July 21-29, 1954, pp. 106-09.
40. W. T. Mallison, Jr., *Op. cit.*, p. 28.
41. *Haaretz*, 16. V. 1960.
42. See W. T. Mallison, Jr., *Op. cit.*, p. 44.
43. See *25th Zionist Congress. Executive Reports*, Jerusalem, March 1960, pp. 75-76.
44. *Zionist General Council. Executive Reports*, Jerusalem, March 1963, p. 192.
45. Hyman Lumer, *Zionism. Its Role in World Politics*, International Publishers, New York, 1973, p. 64.
46. Uri Avnery, *Israel Without Zionists. A Plea for Peace in the Middle East*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1970, p. 175.
47. See *Israel Digest*, No. 3, New York, 1967, p. 4.
48. See *The Jerusalem Post*, March 6, 1967.
49. Quoted from W. T. Mallison, Jr., *Op. cit.*, p. 49.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 50.
51. Richard F. Nyrop (Ed.), *Op. cit.*, p. 134.
52. Don Peretz, *Op. cit.*, p. 44.
53. Richard F. Nyrop (Ed.), *Op. cit.*, p. 133.
54. *Middle East International*, No. 136, October 24, 1980, p. 10.
55. Charles S. Liebman, *Op. cit.*, p. 176.
56. *The Jerusalem Post*, April 29, 1975, p. 7.
57. See *Who's Who in Israel and in the Work for Israel Abroad 1978*, Bronfman and Cohen Publishers, Tel Aviv, 1978, p. 443.
58. See *Voice of Israel*, 1. XII. 1981.
59. See *Journal of Commerce*, March 10, 1982.
60. *Jewish Agency Digest of Press and Events*, Jerusalem, May 16, 1952, pp. 1069-70.
61. Howard M. Sachar, *A History of Israel. From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1976, p. 720.

62. Moses Lasky, *Between Truth and Repose*, San Francisco, 1956, p. 46.
63. W. T. Mallison, Jr., *Op. cit.*, p. 51.
64. *Ibid.*, p. 49.

I. Zvyagelskaya

THE ARMY IN THE SOCIO-POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC STRUCTURE OF ISRAEL

Israel has long been justifiably referred to as a militarised state. In fact, the war industry which consumes an enormous proportion of the country's human and material resources impinges upon practically every aspect of life there. The fact that Israel has been able to build up its armed forces far in advance of what might be expected from its economic potential is primarily the result of that country's importance to the imperialist states. In pursuing an expansionist policy which is directed at territorial seizure, the destruction or weakening of progressive Arab regimes and the subversion of the national liberation movement in the area, the Israeli ruling clique is not only furthering its own interests, but those of Western neocolonialist strategy as well. In this situation the Israeli war machine is to rely in the main on the continued flow of foreign economic and military aid, particularly that from the international Zionist organisations.

Through implementing the programme outlined by the Israeli rulers, the army has been able to acquire a position of such influence in the country that its general staff are no longer merely the executors of government policy, but now take an active part in making it.

The preconditions for this participation arose back in the period of the Zionist colonisation of Palestine. The Israeli army—and this is its distinctive characteristic—was formed and developed under the direct influence of Zionism. The pro-imperialist nature of Zionist policy, which comes directly from the class content of Zionism, is the cause of its organic incompatibility with the national liberation movement, particularly that of the Arab peoples. The Israeli army, imbued as it is with the chauvinist ideas and conceptions upon which the theory and practice of Zionism is based, has never functioned as an instrument of liberation.

Furthermore, its formation and development were the result of confrontation with the Arab national liberation movement, a fact which laid its mark upon the structure of the Israeli armed forces and on their strategy and tactics, and predetermined their reactionary role in the area.

The Zionist predilection for the extensive use of force to implement their policy in Palestine explains the special position of the military in the political structure of the Jewish community and the active participation of the general staff, who are part of the country's ruling clique, in matters relating to the implementation of Zionist plans for the creation of a Jewish state. Thus the army, like other Israeli political institutions, was formed before 1948, and Israel virtually inherited a ready-made political structure with characteristically heavy leanings towards the military.

After the formation of the State of Israel military circles continued to exert considerable influence on official policy. The higher-ranking officers, who held key commanding posts, remained in fact part of the ruling elite, i.e., a clique composed of various strata that reflected the interests of dominant class and exercised power in its name throughout all spheres of state activity.

The dominant role of the army in Israel and the power of the military in the state are conditioned by the expansionist direction of Israeli foreign policy. In conditions of almost unceasing aggressive action on the part of Israel against the neighbouring Arab countries the Israeli high command has been able to wield paramount influence not only in deciding military and strategic objectives, but over a wide range of political and economic problems as well. It is precisely this subjection of the whole of the country's economic, political and social life to the ideas of territorial expansion and the aims of imperialist policy in the Middle East that has given rise to the phenomenon of active military intervention in state affairs in Israel.

The Israeli author Maxim Ghilan has characterised the role of the army in the state as a social institution peculiar to Israel: "Tzahal is not only an army," he writes, "it is a state within a state; a security apparatus; an extremely dynamic economic empire; a never diminishing source of managerial power for the civil economy; a way of life; the main planning authority in Israel for fields as diverse as agriculture, settlement, industrial de-

velopment, law and policing. But first and foremost for the average Israeli, Tzahal is the main channel of his indoctrination.”¹

The military occupy a special place in the socio-political and economic structure of the state and their influence spreads throughout the most diverse spheres of the state apparatus, frequently to areas that are usually considered far removed from military matters.

The Army as a Means of Ideological Indoctrination

Almost the whole of the working population of Israel passes through the military apparatus at one time or another and this makes it possible for the government to use military service as a means for effecting the ideological indoctrination of Israeli society as a whole. In 1980 there were 169.6 thousand in the Israeli armed forces and this number could be increased to 680 thousand after mobilisation. Both men and women are liable to military service, which normally lasts a period of 2-3 years. After demobilisation reservists are required to do an annual period of retraining. Thus the links between the country's civilian body and its military are long maintained and not only are military skills thoroughly secured, but also a definite world outlook is built up on the basis of the ideas inculcated in the army.

To a very great extent the army has also taken upon itself the task of educating the younger generation in the spirit of militarism. With this aim in view a paramilitary organisation calling itself the Gadna was formed and placed simultaneously under the control of the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Education and Culture. It is comprised of schoolchildren from the ages of 14 to 18.

The military also exercise their influence on the youth of Israel through special military education establishments.

The intensive Zionist indoctrination that military personnel undergo in the Israeli armed forces is aimed at uniting them on a nationalist basis and providing ideological justification of the expansionist policies that are implemented with the help of the army. This is also the idea behind “transforming” and “processing” through the army the new arrivals of immigrants. Accord-

ing to Samuel Rolbant, "it is probably not an exaggeration to say that his [the immigrant's] prolonged stay in the Army shapes his future citizenship more than any other factor in the country of his adoption; and that consequently the Army has become the prime factor in nation-making".¹

The immigrants from various countries, who at times differ sharply from each other culturally and even ethnically, are not only taught the language during military service, but also the history and philosophy of Zionism and the "Israeli way of life". "Our soldiers," said the former chief of staff, Rav-Aluf Mordechai Gur, "have to be taught Zionism. If we give them the whole picture they will learn to distinguish between the Sinai passes and Jerusalem, which is beyond all debate as far as we are concerned."³ There can be no doubt that the annexationist approach to the occupied territories, which characterises the thinking of the majority of the Israeli population, is to a large extent developed in the army.

The fact that service in the Israeli armed forces helps to inflame nationalist sentiments is also attested to by the fact that the Arab population of Israel is not required to do it (the only exception to this are the Druz Arabs, part of whom are allowed to serve in the Israeli army so as to purposely separate them from the rest and split the national minorities).

The main source of nationalist and particularly anti-Arab attitudes in the army is the Zionist doctrine itself. Furthermore, this amounts not only to a theoretical knowledge on the part of the soldiers of Zionist "values", but the practical aspects of relations with the Arab population. In particular, the functions that were imposed upon the army in conformity with Zionist doctrine to ensure government control of the occupied lands, and until 1966 of the Arab areas of Israel, could only lead to an intensified "anti-Arab complex".

Police duties are carried out by the specially formed army units, set up to run the occupied Arab lands. The special Nahal units with a total manpower of more than 5 thousand form military settlements in the occupied territories, which are subsequently handed over to the civilian authorities. The military authorities are concerned that these settlements become inhabited by former army men. "The Nahal also provides candidates for per-

manent residence in existing but understaffed border villages as well as supplying recruits to new security settlements. Until these villages become economically viable, their members remain under army command and subject to Nahal discipline.”⁴

The Nahal provides special courses to train instructors for the new immigrant settlements. These instructors coach the new arrivals in basic military techniques and weaponry and are virtually the conduits for the spread of army influence in the immigrant environment.

The Means by Which the Military Participate in State Planning

In conditions of increasing military tension the army general staff, closely linked as it is with the political authorities, has enormous opportunity to spread its influence on the course of events in various aspects of Israeli life and particularly to participate in the formation and implementation of state policy. The continued growth of the involvement of the military elite in the process of government decision-making is both the direct result of militarisation and one of the reasons for its intensiveness.

Consideration of the questions concerned with the socio-political functions of the Israeli army requires that considerable importance be given to an analysis of the role of the officer corps.

One of the characteristics of the Israeli officer corps, which has to a certain extent predetermined its influence in the country, consists in the fact that it is represented in the main by persons born in Palestine or brought there with their parents at an early age. In so far as the prospects for making a successful political career in Israel were highly uncertain (for many years the leadership of the parties, the trade unions and the kibbutzim remained stable), military service with its rapidly changing officer corps was looked upon as the sure way to rapid promotion to the top. Thus the career of the professional soldier became especially attractive for the more ambitious and wealthy young men who had hopes of one day joining the ruling elite. And at a time when the explosive situation that required the closest interconnection

between the Israeli government and the military showed no signs of abating in the Middle East the preconditions came into being for the active intervention of the military establishment in the political activity of the government.

The general staff of the Israeli army is not a fully homogeneous group either from the point of view of its political sympathies, or from the degree of its influence, but throughout the history of the country the military have, as a rule, adopted united extremist positions on the cardinal questions of Israeli policy. Thus the senior officers of the Tzahal have continually demanded a policy of terror, of organising military operations, of making "preventive strikes" and of annexing the occupied territories. This unanimity is explained by the similarity of ideological outlook among the Israeli high command as a whole.

Obviously, not all the representatives of the higher-ranking military have the opportunity of influencing the army or leading circles outside, i.e., not all senior officers can be automatically considered part of the military elite. Membership of the elite is determined by rank, by prestige and by outside contacts with the ruling clique. The military elite is usually considered to be comprised of the chief of the general staff, the chief of operations, the chief of military intelligence, the front commanders, the chief commanding officer of the air force, and a few other high-ranking officers. An officer's level of influence is determined as a rule by the place his unit is given in carrying out the requirements of military doctrine. A special place here, given the geographical position of the country, is always reserved for the air force, while the navy has only limited application. In this connection the air force chief of staff is traditionally considered of greater importance in the Israeli high command than the chief of staff of the navy.⁵

The range of influence of the military in Israel is extremely broad: at a time of intense military tension, when priority is given to "matters of security", the "recommendations" of the military leadership have as their result definite practical steps on the part of the government.

The official channels which the military use to exert their influence on political decision-making are the Tzahal general staff, the intelligence department and the Ministry of Defence.

To determine the place of the military establishment in Israeli foreign policy, let us consider the findings of the bourgeois political analyst, Michael Brecher, as given in his work *The Foreign Policy System of Israel*. Analysing the functions of various elite groups in Israel, Brecher singles out what he calls the Technical Elite (TE), which according to this classification is responsible for carrying out government decisions. This Technical Elite "comprises two groups: i) all persons who have occupied the post of head of an operational department or higher within the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and ii) a Parallel Technical Elite (PTE) in related branches of the civil and military bureaucracy".⁶

"The Defence Establishment (including Security) dominated the Parallel Technical Elite, accounting for almost three-quarters of the posts (56 out of 77). . . The predominance of the military is evident in the fact that half of all the PTE members (29 out of 57) were in the professional military service, that is, they spent many years as high-ranking officers of the Tzahal."⁷ In the Israeli foreign policy system there is a division of functions between the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the general staff of the army and they carry practically an equal measure of responsibility for the implementation of the political line of the state.

This is explained by the presence of a number of connections not only between the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the Parallel Technical Elite, but between the higher political elite, i.e., those persons in the Israeli government that are responsible for making strategic decisions, and the Parallel Technical Elite. The borders between the two have virtually been eroded with the result that some members of the higher political elite like Moshe Dayan, Shim'on Peres, Yitzhak Rabin and Yigael Yadin are also members of the Parallel Technical Elite.

This kind of interpenetration shows the real opportunities that the military leadership has for playing an important role in the process of shaping the policies of the State of Israel. It is further strengthened by the absence of any legislation clearly delineating the duties and responsibilities of the bureaucracy and the military in strategic decision-making. This conclusion was reached by a commission set up after the October War of 1973 under the chairmanship of Shim'on Agron, the Chief Justice

of Israel's Supreme Court, to "examine the causes of the setbacks of the Israeli army".

The military establishment has participated directly in strategic decision-making throughout the whole of the country's history. But its pressure to intensify Israeli policy was most clearly felt on the eve of and during the various occasions when the conflict in the Middle East reached crisis stages.

Thus before the tripartite aggression of 1956 the general staff, with the support of the Prime Minister and Defence Minister Ben Gurion, isolated the "moderate" elements in the government and got it to sanction military operations against Egypt. Furthermore, the Ministry of Defence took upon itself the task of ensuring allied support, thereby virtually replacing the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

On the eve of the 1967 aggression the military joined forces with the extreme right and forced Prime Minister Eshkol to make Moshe Dayan Minister of Defence and to form a coalition cabinet with extremist participation. The outbreak of war was a foregone conclusion.

After this war when the idea began to strengthen in Israel of the army as the "only guarantor of the preservation of the state", the military became even more the dominant factor in determining Israel's attitude to the Arab states. The policy of "opening up" the occupied Arab territories, which was implemented with military help and according to the recommendations of former generals (the "Dayan Plan", the "Allon Plan", the "Sharon Plan"), and the obstructionist approach to the question of a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict led in October 1973 to a new military crisis in the Middle East.

On June 6, 1982, Israel with the support of the United States invaded Lebanon. 85 thousand Israeli soldiers crossed the border and these were later increased to 120 thousand. In undertaking these extensive military operations against Lebanon, Israel was out to destroy both militarily and politically the Palestine Resistance Movement, stop the Palestinians from maintaining any further presence in Lebanon, and physically annihilate the Palestinian leadership and the Palestinian population in the refugee camps. At the time Israel planned to change the political structure of Lebanon and create a right-wing Christian pro-Israeli

government, which would conclude a separate deal on the pattern of the Egyptian-Israeli treaty.

In the opinion of most observers the main role in this aggression was played by the Israeli Defence Minister, Ariel Sharon, who is notorious for his extreme views. Of course, Sharon was supported by Israeli ruling circles which have moved more and more to the right, slipping down to fascism. But at the same time, as the Israeli journalist, Ury Avnery, put it, "essentially this was Sharon's war. He wanted it, he drew up the operational plans for the military and for more than a year he has tried to bring it about."⁸

Sharon and his ministry did, in fact, play a special role in Israel. It is a well-known fact that the aims of the aggression and its scale were chiefly determined by Israel's plans for annexation of the occupied Arab territories, particularly the West Bank and Gaza. To ensure Israeli take-over of these lands Sharon and his entourage drew up a series of measures including hunting out Arab traitors, trying to weaken the influence of the PLO, building Jewish settlements in areas heavily populated by Arabs and driving out the local Arab population. In a bid to reduce the resistance put up by local forces to the occupationists Sharon in late 1981 gave the military regime in the occupied Arab territories a face-lift, calling it a "civil administration". But this fooled nobody—for the Israeli military authorities continued to control things on the West Bank and in Gaza as before. The "new", widely proclaimed policy in the occupied territories, however, collapsed. It not only did not lead to "appeasement" on the part of the people, but gave rise to the strongest resistance that the Israelis had ever faced in the occupied Palestinian territories. The influence of the PLO grew considerably among the local Arab population.

In these conditions war in Lebanon, according to the calculations of the Israeli leaders, was needed to help destroy the PLO and undermine its positions in the occupied territories, in the Arab political arena and on an international scale. In using military force to settle the Palestinian question once and for all, the Israeli strategists gambled on genocide, on the physical destruction of the Palestinian people. And the victims of this slaughter in Lebanon were the old men, the women and the children.

The aggression in Lebanon once again clearly demonstrated the reactionary essence of Israeli militarism. It showed that ruling circles in Israel are trying to use military means for the solution of political problems and, consequently, that the higher ranks of the military are more and more directly participating in determining the state's foreign policy.

Among the factors that promote the expanding political role of the military hierarchy we may include the system of distributing command posts. A new stage of transference in the Israeli military leadership began in 1977 after the coming to power of the Likud bloc. It attested to the process of selecting only those military leaders whose views inclined to the ruling bloc. At the same time individual appointments reflected the attempts of Israeli generals, who already held posts in the government, to create for themselves a base in the Tzahal.

Thus an important role in the selection of candidates to positions on the high command was played by the former Defence Minister, Ezer Weizmann. It was according to his recommendation that Rafael Eytan, who from 1968 to 1973 had headed the commandos, was made chief of the general staff. His name is also linked with a number of aggressive actions against the Arab countries. Eytan in his turn selected appropriate candidates for positions on the general staff. Of the 16 generals on the general staff, eight had previously served in the paras, including the commander of the navy. In this connection the French magazine *L'Express* characterised the new Israeli general staff as selected in the main from "professional bandits".⁹

Ariel Sharon, too, created for himself a power-base in the military leadership: six of the generals served under his command in Unit 101,* and Yehoshua Saguy, who had served under him in the intelligence service, was made head of the Aman (military intelligence).¹⁰

The fact that the most extreme right-wing officers, who were not fastidious in their choice of means, stood at the head of the Tzahal, is proof of the further intensification of Israeli policy in the Arab-Israeli conflict, a policy which to a significant extent is the work of the military hierarchy.

* Unit 101—a commando unit set up in January 1954 to carry out subversive and terrorist acts.

In a bid to increase the influence of the high command and strengthen his own position at the same time, Sharon, who had become Minister of Defence in 1981, proposed at the end of that year the reorganisation of his ministry. His idea was to replace a number of civil servants in the most important posts in the ministry by officers, including those who were on active service. Obviously, the intention was to further strengthen the political positions of the military in the country.

The Israeli military elite is characterised by the following distinctive features. The majority of the high-ranking officers were born in Palestine. Formerly it was customary to divide the Israeli officer corps according to whether they came from the British Army, the Haganah or the Palmach. But time has gradually eroded the differences between them, though even now in the Tzahal there are social groups among the senior officers that are differentiated according to which of the three military groups they belonged to in the past. In this connection it is significant that all the previous chiefs of the general staff—Moshe Dayan, Yitzhak Rabin, Chaim Bar-Lev, Daniel Elazar and Mordechai Gur—came as a rule from the Palmach troops. All these generals have direct or indirect links with the Israeli ruling elite. Obviously, there are other connections and relationships between the present general staff and the civilian elite, but given the dearth of information available on the military establishment these would be extremely hard to trace.

But the influence of the military is spread to all the spheres of the life of the state not only through the senior officers that are on active service, but also by those who have retired and still maintain their caste ties with the army. The high-ranking officers in Israel are potential candidates for the leading posts in all areas of social, political and economic life.

A distinguishing feature of the Israeli army is its rapid interchangeability of personnel: the average age for demobilised officers is approximately 45. After leaving the army a senior officer enters civilian life with all the necessary recommendations. He frequently has a profession learned in the army, sufficient financial resources and, what is most important, as a former member of the army, something which will help him get on well in his civilian career. Reservist officers undertake three-month manage-

rial courses at army expense, and colonels and generals can study at any higher educational institute without sustaining any loss of their former pay. The army also keeps reservist officers on full pay until they find themselves work.

In this respect many Israeli commentators are inclined to explain the army's concern to find work for its demobilised officers as being exclusively due to the fact that they represent a considerable financial burden on the armed forces. But in fact this is far from being the case. On the one hand, this concern is dictated by a desire on the part of the military leaders to make use of their personnel in civilian service and thereby to strengthen the army's influence in various aspects of the political, social and economic life of the country. On the other hand, there are concrete practical considerations to be taken account of. The army tries to avoid any military "brain drain" abroad, for if there is no suitable work at home a former colonel or a general might well be tempted by offers from American or West European companies. Then again, in so far as the high-ranking officers are always considered reservists and can be called up for military service any time the situation in the Middle East worsens, the high command tries to ensure that this source of trained personnel remains in Israel. The personnel department of the Tzahal has an employment bureau which not only finds employment for officers in civilian life, but also helps solve disputes that may arise between former military men and their current civilian employers.

After leaving the army many officers retain their contacts with it. This is shown, in particular, by the fact that they frequently return to military service. Thus in autumn 1979 Colonel Shiler was made head of the intelligence department with the rank of brigadier-general. Previously he had been a reservist and for more than one and a half years had run one of the enterprises of Koor industries.¹¹ Approximately at the same time the former vice-chief of the general staff, Israel Tal, also returned to take up an important position in the army.

Former high-ranking officers, now in reserve, maintain their caste links with the army and occupy important positions in all areas of civilian life.

In recent years there has been a tendency for retired army of-

ficers to increasingly involve themselves in politics. Political motives also explain the interest which the state sector shows in getting them jobs. As experience shows, most of the officers seem to incline towards the state enterprises, despite the fact that here they lose one-third of their pension (in private firms their pensions are paid fully). According to *The Jerusalem Post*, "the very real and growing problem of the soldier-politician and his place in our society . . . certainly existed, beneath the surface, long before that, as officers in their early forties on the verge of demobilization jockeyed for top jobs in industry and finance—jobs which in Israeli reality are all too often within the patronage of the political parties . . . and soon hundreds of senior officers, still intimately connected with the army and ready to resume their service at moments of crisis, [are] moving into the top political and economic posts. In time, this inevitably begins to blur the line between the military and the civilian powers."¹²

The presence of senior officers in the top jobs in state enterprises or in concerns belonging to the Histadrut had by the late 1960s become so common a phenomenon, that it was being said all over Israel that "the state and the Histadrut get generals for managers; private firms must put up with lieutenants and majors".¹³ At the same time many of the demobilised officers who had become presidents, company directors, bank managers, etc., were not totally confined to the world of commerce and economics. Party membership gave them broad scope for political activity.

After the 1967 aggression the number of retired officers who had held high-ranking posts in the Tzahal sharply increased and they began to be directly attracted into politics. Furthermore, the period between demobilisation and the beginning of a political career was reduced. The entry of a general into government was something that had been arranged previously and, therefore, while still in the army, such a general had maintained close contacts with the political apparatus. As the Italian weekly *L'Espresso* put it: "The army is looking for a way to place itself above political power and either penetrate completely, or at least get control over it."¹⁴

From 1967 onwards this has been reflected in all the electoral campaigns in Israel. Furthermore, the direct participation in these

campaigns of the military, whose discharge from the army was only a mere formality, has been a growing trend. At the 1973 elections Generals Ariel Sharon, Ezer Weizmann and Shlomo Lahat played an active role representing the right-wing Likud bloc, while Generals Yigael Allon, Moshe Dayan and Yitzhak Rabin and Colonel Josef Nevo represented the Maarakh bloc. The ultra-right "Movement for Greater Israel" was headed by Major-General Abraham Yoffe and in the Rabin government which was formed in May 1974 important posts were held by former officers and persons linked with the military establishment.

The increased participation of the Israeli military in the political life of the country was also demonstrated in the parliamentary elections in May 1977. For the first time Israeli reservist generals stood at these elections as leaders of new independent political parties. This was particularly the case with the "Democratic Movement for Change", which only appeared in the country's political arena in March of that year.¹⁵ It was headed by General Yigael Yadin and attracted a large number of retired officers, who were representatives of the military-industrial complex and former members of the Labour Party (MAI).

The appearance of this political group that won 15 seats at the Knesseth was the result of a further swing to the right on the part of Israel's officer corps (the "Democratic Movement for Change", even according to Israeli bourgeois observers, stood to the right of the Labour Party). At the same time it showed the desire of the military to ensure themselves reliable places in the Knesseth and in the government by breaking with their old political parties and factions and playing on the contradictions that existed between them. At any event, Yadin certainly believed that with the formation of a coalition government his party, which had a considerable number of seats, would be given an important role to play.

Another group, formed by General Ariel Sharon, was the Shlom Zion Party, which held an extremist position on the Middle East conflict.

The political manoeuvring of the Israeli retired officers or, to be more precise, the employment of new tactical methods in the struggle for political posts, indirectly helped the Likud bloc to come to power, since the political factions formed under its aegis

(this mainly refers to Yadin's party) took votes away from the Labour Party, which had in any case lost its prestige throughout the country having been compromised in numerous scandals.

Although many Israelis voted for the Likud mainly because they did not want to vote for the bankrupt coalition formed by the Labour Party, the results of the elections undoubtedly testified to an intensification of nationalist feeling among the population, fed as it had been on official propaganda. Their further swing to the right was particularly pronounced in the army. According to *Le Monde diplomatique*, "45 per cent of the soldiers voted for the Likud and only 22 per cent for the Maarakh".¹⁶

Key posts in the Begin government which was formed in June 1977 once more went to reservist generals. Moshe Dayan was made Foreign Minister, Ezer Weizmann became Minister of Defence, Yigael Yadin was given the post of Deputy Prime Minister, and Ariel Sharon, whose party had joined the Likud, was made Minister of Agriculture and chairman of the government Settlement Committee. According to the paper *Haolam Hazev* (May 3, 1978) six of the 19 ministries in the Begin Cabinet went to retired highranking officers.

But for all their extremism Begin's policies did not satisfy some of the high-ranking reservists, who believed that he had made far too many concessions to the Arabs in concluding the Egyptian-Israeli treaty. These dissatisfied army men included Youval Ne'eman, Abraham Yoffe and Aharon Davidi, who aligned with the ultra-extremist party, the Hatehiya, which was formed in October 1979.¹⁷ The new party stood for the annexation of the occupied territories and for forcibly driving the Palestinians into the Arab countries.

The rising chauvinistic feeling in Israel, particularly in the armed forces, was again demonstrated in the 1981 parliamentary elections. The Likud bloc headed by Begin won 48 seats in the Knesseth, one more than those obtained by the Maarakh.¹⁸ Significantly, voting in the army was one of the main factors that allowed the Likud bloc to get ahead.

Furthermore, there is every reason to claim that the increasing swing towards fascism in Israel that made itself felt under the Begin government was encouraged by the activity of the country's military hierarchy.

But the military elite provided personnel not only for the laity, but also for the church. Religion, of course, has long been one of the channels through which the army exercises its influence over the country. Here it is primarily a matter of using religion in the army as an effective means of inflaming nationalist feeling and justifying expansionist policies. "It is our duty," says the Chief Rabbi of the Israeli army, Brigadier-General Mordechai Piron, "to bring the message of the Torah to soldiers at all levels. To bring to them 4,000 years of history and culture and tradition. To provide them with the thread of continuity and the historical perspective which explains and justifies the role they have been charged with."¹⁹ Each brigade of the Israeli army has its own rabbi, and a dozen or so priests continually accompany Israeli troops during exercises and participate in various military operations.

The practical application of religious dogma to justify aggressive foreign policy is not limited to the use of religion in the army. In Israel where Judaism and the rabbinate play a role of enormous importance, the extremism of the synagogue priests and the clericals is similar in spirit to that of the military. This makes it possible to use the army rabbis to spread army influence among the civilian priests. For example, the former Chief Rabbi of the Israeli army, General Shlomo Goren, was in 1972 made the Chief Rabbi of Israel.

Let us consider the civilian careers of 50 Israeli generals who left the army between 1954 and 1976. Since it is obvious that the sources,²⁰ which contain data we are keen on, include information on the most prominent generals, this makes it possible to get a fairly accurate picture of the present situation and to draw some conclusions.

First of all, a considerable proportion of the Israeli generals consists of those who were born in Palestine (24 out of 50), which immediately distinguishes them from the old bureaucratic elite of the country. Unfortunately, an analysis of their social composition is not possible owing to the specific characteristics under which the country was formed. According to Israeli sources, the Israeli army "is still dominated by officers who come from collective and cooperative settlements".²¹ But this information does not allow us to judge with sufficient accuracy the social origins of

the high-ranking officers, since they are all children of immigrants who, when they arrived in Palestine, settled down as a rule in the kibbutzim, irrespective of their former occupations.

The distribution of civilian employment among the retired officers is as follows: 12 generals became ministers, advisers, ambassadors or leaders of political parties; 8 took up responsible posts in various ministries and public organisations; 18 were made presidents, directors or managers in state or private companies and banks; 5 took teaching posts or were given administrative positions in higher educational establishments; and on two generals we have no information at all. Of the remaining 5, one became a priest, one a lawyer, one a member of the Nature Reserve Authority, and two received civilian posts: one as chairman of the association concerned with ensuring the well-being of Israeli soldiers and the other as a functionary to deal with the complaints of military personnel, both of which posts presumed the maintenance of close links with the army.

Even from a formal analysis it is clear that the majority of retired generals found themselves work in one form of socio-political activity or another, although the group that made their careers in commerce and the economy is still considerable. From 1967 onwards the number of political appointments have risen sharply. At the same time there have been a number of re-arrangements among the high-ranking officers who became reservists in the early 1960s. For example, the head of the intelligence department, Chaim Herzog, who in 1962 was made manager of a large company, became Israeli Military Governor on the West Bank after the 1967 war and later Israeli representative at the UN. General Zvi Zur, who became director-general of the Mekorot Water Company, was later appointed as special assistant to the Minister of Defence.

At the same time certain generals actively engaged in politics, although they had no official political position. For example, General Abraham Yoffe, Chairman of the Nature Reserve Authority, represented the Likud bloc for a number of years in the Knesseth.

The fact that as a result of the Likud bloc victories in the 1977 and 1981 elections those generals who were members of the Labour Party were forced to lose their former political posts does

not contradict the overall trend to an increase in the political role of the reservist officers. Furthermore, the existence of a certain coordination between the various Zionist political parties and groupings in the development of state policy and the presence of a kind of "kitchen" and "shadow cabinets" make it possible for them in the future, even if not so patently, to influence decision-making at a government level.

The choice of career after demobilisation is to a large extent determined by the post held in the armed forces. The general staff and the high command are the most conservative part of the army with a distinctly corporate character. The fact that they virtually belong to the ruling elite ensures them key political posts after retirement. In this respect the civilian careers of the chiefs of the general staff of the Israeli army are significant.

Of the ten chiefs of the general staff, one engaged in scientific activity, three received responsible positions in commerce, five became politicians. It is a characteristic fact that from 1967 onwards four former chiefs of the general staff became politicians. The exception was Daniel Elazar, and this can probably be explained by the fact that he did not retire voluntarily, but was removed from his post after the findings of the Agranat Commission were published, for these findings laid on him the responsibility for the mistakes that were made in 1973. For this reason Elazar could not try for a place among the higher echelons of political power in Israel. As for Mordechai Gur, although his election to the Central Committee of the Labour Party does not constitute undoubted proof of his decision to choose a political career, it is, nevertheless, highly significant bearing in mind the clear inclination to politics which he showed when he held the post of chief of the general staff.

Thus after leaving military service more and more high-ranking officers take up political posts and in this way the army becomes more and more closely linked with the political leadership of the country.

An analysis of their family relations with members of the country's political and economic elite is also of considerable importance in understanding the role of the reservist officers, for it shows the exclusiveness of this ruling body. For example, Ezer Weizmann's uncle, Chaim Weizmann, was Israel's first President; while

Moshe Dayan's father, Shmuel Dayan, was one of the leaders of the Labour Party and for several years a Knesseth deputy. The father of Daniel Tolkowsky, ex-commander of Israeli air force, was Israeli Ambassador to Switzerland. The sons of Yitzhak Halevi Herzog, the Chief Rabbi of Israel, both held responsible positions in the Israeli civil service: General Chaim Herzog was at one time chief of army intelligence and then became Israeli representative at the UN, while Ya'akov Herzog was Director-General of the Prime Minister's Office and senior adviser to three Prime Ministers, David Ben Gurion, Levi Eshkol and Golda Meir. Chaim Herzog is related to a former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Abba Eban, being married to his sister-in-law. The former General Secretary of the Labour Party and one-time Minister of Education, Aharon Yadlin, has family ties with Yitzhak Rabin.

An important role in Israel is played by the Hacohen "tribe". David Hacohen served as chairman of the Defence and Foreign Relations Committee of the Knesseth and his family contains many representatives of the Israeli military elite and the civil administration. One of his daughters is married to Uzi Narkiss, who from 1965 to 1969 was head of the central command of the Israeli army, while his second daughter is married to Aharon Yadlin mentioned above. One of Mrs. Ruppin's daughters (one of David Hacohen's sisters) is married to Yigael Yadin, one-time chief of staff of the Israeli army, and her second daughter is married to Dr. Zevi Dinstein, the Deputy Minister of Finance. In addition to this, the Hacohen family also has ties with other highly placed persons in Israel.²²

Thus the exclusiveness of the elite groups and the nepotism that characterises Israel make it possible for the members of this elite to exert indirect influence on the course of events in the most varied spheres of Israeli life.

The Military-Industrial Complex: Characteristic Features

In an attempt to implement the basic propositions of their military and political doctrine which envisages the seizure and annexation of Arab territories, the Israeli leaders have put the whole

of their economy at the service of the war machine, utilising their manpower and material resources for military purposes. The militarisation of the Israeli economy finds its expression in the continued growth of government expenditure on military requirements, in the priority development of the local war industry in which civilian branches of the economy are drawn into the sphere of military production, and in the formation of the military-industrial complex, which virtually determines the direction of economic development and is the main consumer of scientific and technological advances.

The first and main consequence of the militarist policy is the continued growth of military spending on the part of the government. Thus in 1970 military expenditure amounted to 1,429 million dollars, whereas in 1977 it had risen to 4,259 million. This absolute increase in the volume of military spending between 1970 and 1977 was accompanied by a growth in its share of the country's GNP (per cent)²³:

1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
19.9	23.6	21.1	46.3	32.0	35.9	36.3	29.9

It is significant that the sharp increase in military spending took place at a time when Israel was engaged in the greatest expansion of its territory to form what the country's military and political leaders described as its "ideal" borders. Another sharp rise in the country's military budget took place after the aggression of 1967, which resulted in Israel becoming, as the former chairman of the World Jewish Congress, Nahum Goldmann, was forced to admit, "an occupation power".²⁴

In 1980 Israeli military expenditure rose, according to the *Time* magazine (18. V. 1981), to 5.4 billion dollars, but in all likelihood this figure does not take account of all the resources spent on military requirements. The covert character of the country's military expenditure has been referred to in recent years by many Israeli economists. At a symposium held in Jerusalem in December 1978 Simha Maoz, one of the participants, stated that "the actual military burden is 70 per cent more than the official data".²⁵ Professor Ben Shahar at the same seminar revealed that since the establishment of the state military spending had increased 40-fold.²⁶

The growth of the Israeli military budget is the material guar-

antee of the country's expansionist policy and the desire of the leadership to strengthen its positions on the occupied territories through the use of armed force. These aims, which require maintaining the armed forces at a material and technological peak, have entailed enormous purchases of modern weaponry from abroad and the creation of a national arms industry.

One of the characteristics of Israeli militarism, which has allowed the country in a relatively short period to orientate its economy on military needs and, despite the almost complete absence of natural resources and the predominance of petty and medium-size enterprises in the industrial infrastructure, to create a fairly powerful war industry, lies in the active participation of foreign investors in Israeli military production and in the aid provided by international Zionism and the imperialist powers, particularly the military-industrial complex of the United States.

Foreign capital investments are of great importance for the Israeli war industry, and therefore it is the country's policy to encourage an influx of foreign capital. Today there are several hundred foreign companies operating in Israel, including 23 of the major US monopolies. Among the leading US companies that have invested heavily in the Israeli war industry are General Telephone and Electronics (investing in the Israeli concern of Tadiran), Control Data (Albit and Contal), Motorola (own enterprise), Miles Laboratories (Miles Yeda and Miles Chimalim) and Monsanto (Monsol). According to the Israeli commentator, Tamar Goznanski, "these are closely connected with US military business and are Pentagon suppliers".²⁷

An important role in the Israeli war industry is also played by French, West German and Belgian capital. Other decisive factors in promoting the development of the Israeli war industry, apart from the growth of foreign capital investment, have been the divulgence of the latest military technological advances to Israeli experts, the sale to Israel of Western patents, and the offers of modern technology, ready-made components, particularly turbo-prop engines.

Together with the use of ready-made components Israel is trying to modernise and produce with its existing industry some of the weapons that it previously bought from the West. In late 1976, for example, the Israeli Ministry of Defence, according to a re-

port in *The Jerusalem Post*, asked the United States for permission to use its government credit not to buy 175 American M-60 tanks, as had previously been agreed, but to produce an equivalent number of its own Chariot tanks.²⁸

Today new trends are evident in US-Israeli arms dealing. The United States remains as before Israel's main supplier of armaments and in fact the total volume of this trade increases annually (after the October War Israel began receiving annual arms supplies from the US worth of 1.5 billion dollars; in the financial year 1978/79 this sum rose to over 3 billion). But Washington has now begun to offer Israel all-round aid in the development of the latter's own war industry. And in their turn the Israelis, who use American weapons in the field, pass on their recommendations to the Pentagon for modifications and improvements in them. Israel's interest in further cooperation is also shown by the fact that it is continually trying to get Washington's agreement to allow the production of spare parts for American planes sent to Israel to be carried out in Israeli aircraft factories.

Although American companies will not allow Israel to use components and spares produced in the United States for military hardware that is to be exported, this does not alter the general policy of increasing American aid for the Israeli war industry.

Military production in Israel is given priority development. In recent years more than half the industrial work force has been directly employed at arms factories or at plants producing orders for the army.

The government encourages private concerns to go over to military production, concluding long-term contracts with them and providing low-interest loans. Thus more and more is civil industry being drawn into the web of the war industry.

Israel's own war industry provides its army with 95 per cent of its requirements for light weapons and equipment, 70-80 per cent of its requirements for electronics and 90 per cent of its ammunition needs. It also makes it possible for Israel to enter the world market as an exporter of arms. According to research done in 1979, Israel exports one billion dollars worth of arms and military equipment to the developing countries. This largely goes to the reactionary regimes of Latin America and Africa, to which the United States does not wish to be seen to be selling

arms direct. And here again is yet another one of the specific characteristics of the American-Israeli military alliance. Israel is increasingly being used by Washington as a front. Thus, when, for example, the United States refused to sell Taiwan F-16 fighters, Israel went ahead with the agreement of the White House and concluded a deal with Taiwan to supply the latter with Kfir fighters worth a reported cost of 300 million dollars.²⁹

A special place in the overall structure of Israeli arms export is taken by the Republic of South Africa. In exchange for the weapons which the Israelis supply to the racist regime in Pretoria they receive enriched uranium, which is the basic raw material required for the nuclear industry.

According to the *Time* magazine, in the mid-1970s 45 per cent of the entire output (in terms of value) of the Israeli arms industry went for export.³⁰ But even in the future Israel will never be able to achieve full self-payment in the matter of arms purchases, since, in the first place, its own material and technological base is too small and, second, the expansionist plans of its leaders require the purchase of expensive military equipment from abroad. In recent years exports (in terms of value), including the export of military technology, have only covered half the costs of imports and 30 per cent of military expenditure.

One other characteristic of Israeli militarism consists in the unique variety of functions of and the special position held by the country's Ministry of Defence. The comprehensive role of Israel's armed forces shows itself also in the unusual functions of its Defence Ministry. The ministry owns and runs all factories producing military equipment and undertakes the technological education of their work force. These factories manufacture an increasingly wide range of products, including individual parts, spares and equipment for all types of imported tanks and planes used in the Israeli army. The war industry has purposely created a market for its exports so as to earn hard currency with which to purchase strategical raw materials and equipment and thereby expand production further.

At the same time the Ministry of Defence plays an important role in the work of many of the other Israeli ministries, particularly the ministries of industry, finance, and agriculture. The direct involvement of the armed forces in the economy, a phenom-

cnon which appears at practically all levels (i.e., in the formation of agricultural settlements, in the manufacture and marketing of agricultural produce, in industrial production and in building), is what characterises the military-industrial complex in Israel. Its influence on economic development takes place not only at the point where civil and military interests intersect, but spreads throughout what are normally thought of as being the "civilian" sectors of the economy. As Maxim Ghilan puts it, "the military-industrial complex is responsible for production, and often for sale and distribution".³¹

The military-industrial complex to a considerable extent determines new directions for scientific and technological development in Israel. The Ministry of Defence has become the main consumer of scientific and technological advances. Between 1967 and 1972 alone Ministry of Defence spending on science and technology tripled to reach a figure of 54 million dollars, or 0.8 per cent of the country's GNP. The military research budget is virtually greater than the civilian budget, since part of military research is carried out at civilian institutes and laboratories. Some university professors advise the Ministry of Defence and work in military laboratories from two weeks to two months a year.³² The main part in the development of new types of weaponry in Israel belongs to the Defence Department's Scientific Development Projects Division. Since 1967 it has produced about one hundred new weapons systems. According to Fuad Jabber, "the Defence Ministry and the Army were entrusted with supplying services that would normally be provided by the civilian sector, not least among them being the manufacture of weapons and munitions, the assembling and servicing of aircraft, and research activities in several fields, such as rocketry and electronics, of military as well as civilian importance".³³

The varied functions of the Israeli war industry have determined its particular importance in the country's economic development. Furthermore, given the expansionist policy of the government it is the army that dictates the main lines of economic development. In particular, the military decide such matters as the purchasing of arms from abroad, increasing arms manufacture at home, raising the volume of arms exports and developing new types of weapons. Recommendations in these areas on the part of

the military rulers affect the country's economy and determine its activity on the diplomatic front.

The military exert their influence through commissions of various kinds, which more often than not are headed by regular officers. For example, in 1966 General Amos Horev presided over a number of technological commissions even though he was on active military service. One of these was a commission formed to study automated production methods and another was a committee set up to prepare a forecast of Israel's future productive forces.

One of the main prerequisites for the further expansion of military influence on the economy is the fact that the Ministry of Defence not only controls and runs the arms factories, but also provides their personnel. According to the Israeli writer, Hirsh Goodman, the appointment of reservists to responsible posts in industry is more a result of army pressure on the civilian market than a natural desire by this market to employ an officer. This pressure is thought to exist particularly in those industries linked to the defence machine, where the military is keen to have former officers—mainly from the technical branches—implanted in the firms with which it has to do business.

By occupying important posts in the economy the reservist officers are able to participate in the distribution of government orders and government grants, etc. Their advice is often listened to by the Ministry of Finance. The decisive role of the Israeli military leadership is felt in practically all the main sectors of the economy, particularly those that are involved in military production.

Thus, for instance, the board of directors of Israel Aircraft Industries, which has the monopoly of aircraft and rocket technology, is appointed jointly by the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Transport. In the Tadiran Israel Electronics Industry, which is the country's main producer of electronics, 90 per cent of the administrative and engineering staff are former military communications personnel. And this situation is far from being uncommon in other branches of the Israeli war industry.

The connections that the Ministry of Defence and the intelligence services have with the war industry are particularly evident in the sphere of nuclear energy. Israel is considered to have

begun its nuclear activity on May 3, 1952, when it set up an Atomic Energy Commission to function under the aegis of the military. Today the latter control design, experimental work and production, in fact everything connected with nuclear energy. A large proportion of the personnel engaged in this sphere also work for the Mossad, the Israeli secret service. Although the contribution made by military research institutes to the Israeli nuclear development programme is unknown, it is thought to be considerable. According to information contained in the American periodical *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, "Israel's military establishment has several large laboratories scattered across the country and has some technicians in high explosives who would be needed to develop the complex detonation device for the bomb. Military research is officially budgeted at a rate equal to 1 per cent of the country's gross national product, but independent estimates suggest that it must actually reach a total of 1.3 to 1.5 per cent of the GNP."³⁴

Military participation in the building up of Israel's nuclear potential is also seen in the fact that the Jericho missiles with a range of 450 kilometres were built at Ministry of Defence plants in a comparatively short time. Many experts believe that these rockets which were designed in the early 1960s with the aid of the French Dassault company are of little use for conventional operations as they are intended to carry warheads with enormous destructive power.

The bombers that Israel has bought from the United States may also be used to carry nuclear weapons.

It was the military, rather than the industrial objectives of the Israeli nuclear energy programme that were mentioned by the Italian magazine, *Tempo*, when it wrote: "For a country like Israel which . . . in 1949 had to buy its nails from abroad and is now exporting rockets and jet-planes even to Japan . . . it is impossible to claim that its nuclear energy programme is purely for 'industrial purposes'."³⁵

The decisive influence of the military in the nuclear field and in the Israeli war industry as a whole is, according to Fuad Jabber, ensured by the fact that "Israel's nuclear establishment was set up and is being run and serviced by the military to all intents and purposes. Even though crucial decisions, such as the go-ahead

to a weapons programme, will be made at the highest political level, there is no doubt that the pressures that can be exerted by military circles would be enormous, not only because of their influence and power in a 'nation in arms' such as Israel, but precisely because they have the largest share in the day-to-day running of the programme."³⁶

The militarisation of the Israeli economy and the spread of military interests throughout the different spheres of the economy have led, as a result of the non-productive character of military expenditure, to reduced output in the civilian sector and increased financial difficulties.

The rising expenditure on arms, together with the building of military settlements on the occupied Arab territories, has meant that Israel has the highest level of inflation in the world. According to the International Labour Organisation, it amounted to 131.5 per cent in 1980.³⁷

The high level of military spending has also led to an intensification of Israel's economic and social problems and made the country exclusively dependent on foreign aid. Israel's national debt in 1980 amounted to 17.5 billion dollars, which was virtually equivalent to the state budget for that year and comprised 83 per cent of the country's GNP.³⁸

Devaluation, spiralling increases in the cost of living, a clearly "overheated economy" and disproportionate economic development—such are the consequences of Israel's militarist policy and of the activity of its military-industrial complex.

* * *

The militarisation of the social, political and economic life of Israel and the whipping up of war psychosis, together with direct and indirect government support for ultra-right movements and groups, have created a particular psychological climate in Israel that has encouraged the growth of nationalist feeling.

But, despite the intoxication with chauvinism and militarism, in Israel there are forces that oppose the annexationist policy of the government and desire peace with the Arab states and the settlement of the Palestinian question on a just and equal basis. This struggle for a just peace and genuine democracy is led by

the Communist Party of Israel, which has consistently spoken out against the expansionist desires of the Zionist ruling circles and the separate deals which only serve to complicate a comprehensive settlement of the conflict in the Middle East that would take account of the interests of all peoples and states concerned.

Fresh impetus to struggle of the Israeli working people against the adventurist policies of their government was given by the latter's barbaric aggression in Lebanon in the summer and autumn of 1982.

It is significant that for the first time in Israeli history the government was unsuccessful in time of war in getting a consensus on a nationalistic basis. The Israeli people themselves protested at their government's aggression in Lebanon and a committee was set up to oppose the war there. Demonstrations involving thousands of people were held demanding not only a cessation of hostilities but also a just settlement of the Palestinian problem. Furthermore, Israeli soldiers returning from Lebanon also joined in the anti-war movement. Thus the following petition was signed by the soldiers of one tank unit: "We, soldiers who fought in Lebanon, declare that it is time to put an end to wars and that there is no consensus for military solutions. The Palestinian entity problem has only a political solution. We must warn against silence on the part of those politicians who let Sharon go so far."³⁹

On July 25 Eli Geva, a colonel in the Israeli Army, refused to issue orders to his tank brigade to take part in the attack on Beirut. On Begin's orders he was immediately removed from his post.

At the same time the ruling elite continues to play on the nationalist sentiments of certain circles using various methods, including service in the Israeli armed forces, to encourage chauvinism. And recently the ultra-right, fascist-style groups have been given considerable scope for their activity.

But despite this, recognition of the unrealistic and ruinous nature of the present government's expansionist policies is growing in Israel. And although the reactionary Zionist circles hold as before their dominant positions and resort to harsh means to crush progressive trends and forces, time is working against them. The voices of those who want to save their people from new military adventures are growing ever stronger in Israel.

References

1. Maxim Ghilan, *How Israel Lost Its Soul*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1974, p. 245.
2. Samuel Rolbant, *The Israeli Soldier. Profile of an Army*, Thomas Yoseloff, New York, 1970, p. 208.
3. *The Jerusalem Post*, August 12, 1976, p. 8.
4. Riad N. el-Rayyes and Dunia Nahas (Eds.), *Politics in Uniform: A Study of the Military in the Arab World and Israel*, an-Nahar Press Services, Beirut, 1972, pp. 135-36.
5. Yuval Elizur and Eliahu Salpeter, *Who Rules Israel?*, Harper and Row, New York, 1973, pp. 204-05.
6. Michael Brecher, *The Foreign Policy System of Israel. Setting, Images, Process*, Oxford University Press, London, 1972, p. 430.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 468.
8. *Haolam Hazeih*, (Tel Aviv), July 16, 1982, p. 15.
9. *L'Express*, 24 février, 1979.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Yediot Abronot*, September 2, 1979.
12. *The Jerusalem Post*, January 10, 1974, p. 8.
13. Maxim Ghilan, *Op. cit.*, p. 250.
14. *L'Espresso*, No. 31, 1973, p. 16.
15. In 1978 this party split into several political groups.
16. *Le Monde diplomatique*, No. 279, juin 1977, p. 20.
17. *Ibid.*, No. 309, decembre 1979, p. 7.
18. See *Pravda*, July 10, 1981.
19. *The Jerusalem Post*, June 5, 1973, p. 10.
20. See *Who Is Who in Israel and in the Work for Israel Abroad 1973-1974*, Bronfman and Cohen Publishers, Tel Aviv, 1976; *Generals in Israel*, Tel Aviv, 1968.
21. M. Cortis and M. Chertoff (Eds.), *Israel: Social Structure and Change*, Transaction Books, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1973, p. 424.
22. See Yuval Elizur and Eliahu Salpeter, *Op. cit.*, pp. 27-28.
23. *The Military Balance. 1973-1974, 1974-1975, 1976-1977, 1979-1980*, The International Institute for Strategic Studies, London, 1974; 1976; 1979.
24. *Le Monde*, 29 mai, 1970, p. 2.

25. *Yediot Ahronot*, December 21, 1978.
26. See *Information Bulletin. Communist Party of Israel*, No. 2-3, Tel Aviv, 1979.
27. *World Marxist Review*, Vol. 14, No. 7, July 1971, p. 32.
28. *The Jerusalem Post*, December 17, 1976, p. 1.
29. *Financial Times*, July 6, 1978, p. 4.
30. See *Time*, Vol. 109, No. 7, January 31, 1977, p. 16.
31. Maxim Ghilan, *Op. cit.*, p. 247.
32. See *Le Monde*, 16 juillet, 1971, pp. 1, 7.
33. Fuad Jabber, *Israel and Nuclear Weapons. Present Option and Future Strategies*, Chatto and Windus, London, 1971, p. 52.
34. *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, Vol. XXX, No. 7, September 1974, pp. 32-33.
35. *Tempo*, No. 50, 1974, p. 24.
36. Fuad Jabber, *Op. cit.*, p. 52.
37. *Information Bulletin. Communist Party of Israel*, No. 2, Tel Aviv, 1981, p. 16.
38. See *Time*, Vol. 117, No. 20, May 18, 1981, p. 26.
39. *Israel and Palestine*, No. 92, Paris, July-August 1982, pp. 14, 15.

N. Osipova

THE ZIONIST LOBBY IN WASHINGTON

The organised Jewish community in the United States is a complex system, which includes various religious, cultural, educational, occupational, philanthropic, social and political institutions. Apart from organisations that function purely at a local level there are more than 200 that are nation-wide, the majority of which are Zionist or pro-Zionist.

Here all the main currents of international Zionism are represented, the so-called "world Zionist parties", each of which functions in its "own" specific Jewish milieu. The majority of these parties have their headquarters in Israel and are essentially affiliated to Israeli parties. Thus the Herut Party, which at present heads the ruling coalition in Israel and which belongs to an extreme right-wing current known as the "Zionist-revisionists", has its branch in the United States called the Herut USA. The American "Zionist-revisionists" represent the same group of the Jewish bourgeoisie and bourgeois intelligentsia that stand politically close to the ultra-reactionary all-American groups. The "Zionist-revisionists" are also linked with such terrorist organisations as the Jewish Defence League and the Jewish Armed Resistance, which operate like the fascist stormtroopers.

The Liberal Party of Israel, which was also part of the Menachem Begin government, is connected via the World Union of General Zionists with the oldest and most influential Zionist organisation in the United States, the Zionist Organisation of America. The right-centrist current of the "General Zionists" is oriented upon the middle and big bourgeoisie. In America many of the leaders of the Zionist Organisation of America support the Republican Party or the right wing of the Democratic Party.

The clerical current of the "religious Zionists", which relies for support on the middle and petty-bourgeois orthodox Jews, is

represented in the United States by the Religious Zionist Alliance. This organisation has close links with the National Religious Party in Israel, which is also now part of the ruling coalition. During the late 1970s a number of individual Zionist organisations for the reformist and conservative Judaists were formed under slogan of "religious pluralism".

The Labour Zionist Alliance of the United States, which gets its support from the petty bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia and the worker aristocracy, is virtually affiliated to the Israeli Labour Party which is at present in opposition. These "worker Zionists" are characterised by a mixture of sophisticated Zionist demagoguery and social-reformist ideas. Their influence is particularly notable among the leadership of the AFL-CIO and the two parties, the Social-Democrats USA and the Democratic Socialist Committee. At the same time the Labour Zionist Alliance maintains close links with the US Democratic Party supporting its candidates at elections.

As distinct from these organisations, which represent essentially Israeli parties, the American Women's Zionist Organisation (Hadassah), and the equivalent men's organisations, the B'nai Zion (Sons of Zion) and the American Jewish League for Israel, which form a united front with it, have no links with any specific Israeli parties. The Hadassah and its allies form the nucleus of the World Confederation of United Zionists, whose headquarters is in the United States, not Israel. This group of Zionists functions under the slogan "Non-Interference in the Inter-Party Struggle in Israel" and lays stress on "strengthening the American-Jewish community". In US politics they take a centrist line, which means that they have influence in both the Democratic and Republican parties. At the election of delegates to the 29th World Zionist Organisation Congress the Hadassah and its allied groups took half of the votes.

All the official Zionist organisations that recognise the programme of the World Zionist Organisation are part of the American Zionist Federation, which was formed in 1971. But membership of the Federation can also be conferred on individuals who do not wish to involve themselves with any particular Zionist organisation.

Organisational diversification and tactical flexibility are what

has allowed Zionism to build for itself such a powerful base in the United States. As was declared at the 29th Congress of the World Zionist Organisation, of the 1.2 million members of that organisation (outside Israel) 900 thousand were Americans. True, this figure is undoubtedly too high. Zionists have always tried to give an exaggerated picture of their own strength and so they claim their membership is greater than it in fact is: in reality only 200 thousand American Jews took part in electing delegates to the 29th Congress. But even so, it must be admitted that the Zionists are enormously influential among the American Jewish community.

This influence is not only exerted through the official Zionist organisations, but through ideological and political influence on the Jewish bourgeois and petty-bourgeois organisations that are officially "non-Zionist". These include the B'nai B'rith (Sons of the Testament) with half a million members in 40 countries, the American Jewish Labour Committee which also has a membership of half a million, the American Jewish Congress (300 thousand), the National Council of Jewish Women (100 thousand) and the American Jewish Committee (50 thousand). The American Jewish Committee is particularly important. Its relatively small membership is easily compensated for by the "qualitative level" of its members, for practically all its members are more or less prominent representatives of the rich American Jewish bourgeoisie. Although, as a rule, it formally refuses to enter into any agreements with the other, more numerous organisations, the American Jewish Committee plays a leading role in the American Jewish financial institutions, since its members head the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, the United Jewish Appeal, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (Joint), the United Israel Appeal and the Israel State Bonds Organisation. Many of the leaders of official Zionist organisations are also members of the American Jewish Committee.

The power and potential of the American Zionists, who have won over to their cause a significant section of the Jewish community in the United States, is clearly evident in the work of the Zionist lobby in Washington. On the one hand, this lobby is one of the political instruments of monopoly capitalist groups in the United States acting within the framework of the American po-

litical system; on the other, it is an integral part of the organisational structure of international Zionism. The community of interests between American imperialism and international Zionism in their struggle against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the international working-class movement and the forces of national liberation determines the framework and content of the activity of the Zionist lobby in the United States.

The Zionist lobby in Washington first began to make itself effective during the First World War, when American Zionists played an important role in getting the support of President Woodrow Wilson for the Balfour Declaration. In 1922 they succeeded in passing the Lodge-Fish Resolution through Congress, which gave approval to the creation of a "Jewish national home" in Palestine. The next high point in the activity of the Zionist lobby came during the 1940s, when international Zionism finally orientated itself upon American imperialism, which at the time was the main claimant to world domination. In 1944 their demand for a "Jewish State" was supported at the congresses of both the Democratic and Republican parties and in 1945 similar resolutions were adopted by both houses of Congress. Subsequently close links were established with the Truman administration. In 1947 and 1948, the years when the Palestine question was being discussed at the United Nations, the US Zionist lobby was particularly active to convince imperialist circles in the United States that a future Jewish State under Zionist control would be the best defence of the West's interests in the Middle East.

After the creation of the State of Israel the main efforts of the Zionist lobby were put to conducting pro-Israeli activity. In 1967 the Zionist lobby intensified its work enormously to the extent that in the 1970s it became a permanent factor in American political life. It held firm positions in the coalition of reactionary forces that was headed by representatives of the military-industrial complex and that opposed international detente.

Today the Zionist lobby in the United States includes Israel's embassy and its consulates, special Zionist lobbying organisations and coordinating centres that involve the whole organised American Jewish community in pro-Zionist lobbying. Apart from the Zionist and pro-Zionist strata among the American Jewish bourgeoisie, other political groupings, particularly representatives

of the military-industrial complex, also take part in pro-Israeli lobbying. Therefore the terms "Zionist lobby" and "pro-Israeli lobby" are not identical.

The Zionist lobby in Washington mainly functions through the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) and other American Jewish lobbying institutions such as the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organisations, the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, the B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Committee. Senators and members of the House of Representatives, as well as workers of the Congress apparatus may also join the nucleus of the Zionist lobby as "individual members".

The AIPAC was officially formed in 1954 as an intra-political lobbying organisation. It is virtually the direct continuation of the American Zionist Emergency Council (AZEC) which was formed in 1939 and began to function during the Second World War. According to the Zionist historian, Robert Silverberg, the "AZEC budget of more than \$500,000 a year was underwritten by the Jewish National Fund and the Palestine Foundation Fund, which in theory are supposed to use their money for, respectively, the purchase of land in Palestine and the economic development of Palestine".¹ Thus the donations for Palestine were sent to an organisation which had as its aim the spread of Zionist political propaganda in the USA. The AZEC opened a lobbying centre in Washington with 14 committees and a professional staff, and some 400 regional Zionist emergency councils each staffed with from 8 to 12 persons and taking their orders from the Washington centre. The AZEC worked in close contact not only with the American Zionist leaders, but also with representatives of the Jewish Agency including its American Section which was set up in 1946.

After the formation of the State of Israel the Zionist movement in the United States was reorganised as a result of which in 1949 the AZEC was renamed the American Zionist Council (now the American Zionist Federation-AZF). From this the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs was formed and in 1954 renamed the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC). The ultimate aim of this restructuring was the formation of a formally "independent" organisation, which was not

registered as a foreign agent. This made it possible for the AIPAC as a philanthropic organisation to take advantage of tax relief (otherwise two-thirds of its contributions would have been taxable). In 1980 the budget of the AIPAC amounted to 1.3 million dollars plus further 200 thousand spent on the weekly bulletin *Near East Report* which has a mailing list of 30 thousand subscribers and is sent free of charge to all Congressmen and many civil servants and politicians.

In recent years the AIPAC staff has been getting steadily larger. In 1970 there were only 6, by 1980 there were nearly 30 members.² From 1954 to 1974 the executive director of the AIPAC was Isaiah L. Kenen. From 1974 until 1980 the post was occupied by Morris J. Amitay, former adviser to Senator Abraham Ribicoff. In September 1980 Thomas A. Dine, former adviser to Senator Edward Kennedy, became the director. The AIPAC has among its membership the leaders of all the leading Jewish organisations in the United States, including those who conduct independent lobbying in Washington, and this makes it the chief organisation among the Zionist lobby. Moreover, the coordinating and organising role of the AIPAC is further enhanced for the fact that it includes among its membership the 12 thousand functionaries of the national and local Jewish organisations.³

The AIPAC not only maintains close links with the leadership of the American Jewish community and the Zionist movement in the United States, but also with the Israeli leaders. There have been, for example, press reports to the effect that Isaiah L. Kenen had meetings with the Israeli Prime Minister during his visits to Israel. But in Washington itself the AIPAC and the Israeli embassy prefer to maintain a certain distance so as to make it look as though the AIPAC is independent from Israel. However, the real nature of the relationship between the Zionist lobbyists and the Israeli leaders is shown in a statement made by Morris J. Amitay who declared that "what is good for Israel is good for the United States".⁴

The main function of the AIPAC consists in preparing "materials" and developing arguments for speeches by the pro-Israeli coalition in Congress. These speeches are frequently edited by AIPAC staffers who on occasion even formulate appropriate bills. In particular, the Committee cooperates closely with Senators

Patrick Moynihan and Henry Jackson. The AIPAC also takes part in determining the tactics of the pro-Israeli coalition when the houses or Congress commissions are discussing matters that are of interest to the Zionists. Another important function of the AIPAC is the organisation of non-legislative acts by members of the pro-Israeli coalition such as, for example, the sending of open letters to the press by Congressmen when these letters are addressed to the administration and demand the acceptance or rejection of certain diplomatic moves. In a certain sense these public acts express the opinion of Congress and are an important means by which the Zionist lobby brings pressure to bear on the executive authorities through the legislative bodies. The AIPAC is also interested in visits of Congressmen to the President or other highly placed members of the administration in order to express their views on US policy in the Middle East.

Important political repercussions also result from the annual AIPAC conferences in which members of the Committee and Congressmen take part. Here a general evaluation is given of US-Israeli relations, which as a rule coincides with the official Israeli point of view, and specific objectives are set out for the pro-Israeli coalition for an appropriate period.

The AIPAC carefully evaluates the position of each Congressman and registers the results of his voting on the various questions, his attitude to them and his degree of participation as "co-author" of pro-Zionist resolutions and open letters, etc.

According to the *Time* magazine, "although most of its attention focuses on Congress, the Jewish [i.e., Zionist.-*Author.*] lobby does not ignore the White House, Pentagon or State Department. . . The most direct pressure on the Executive Branch is exerted by the highly active Israeli embassy in Washington and by visiting officials from Israel."⁵ The Israeli embassy maintains direct contacts with the White House both through the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs and through the special counsel responsible for contacts with the Jewish community. This latter post is usually held by one of the White House aides who is well known among the Jewish community. Under Harry Truman the post belonged to David K. Niles, under John Kennedy to Myer Feldman, under Lyndon Johnson to Arthur Goldberg, under Richard Nixon to Leonard Garment and Wil-

liam Safire, under Gerald Ford to M. Friedman and Richard Goldwin, and under Jimmy Carter to M. Siegel, Ed Sanders, Robert Strauss, Philip Klutznik, Stuart Eizenstat and Robert Lipschutz. Under Ronald Reagan the new liaison between the White House and the Jewish community is Jacob Stein, who in 1973-1974 was chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organisations. The Israeli embassy has permanent contacts with the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and three Israeli military attachés have regular briefings at the Pentagon. The embassy also maintains regular contacts with the Department of Middle East and South Asia which is attached to the State Department.

The Israeli embassy has close relations with Congress and takes an active part in the lobbying of its members. The Israeli ambassador regularly invites 15-20 of the most influential people in the Senate and the House of Representatives to informal lunches. Embassy officials also visit Congress for the purposes of "observation", although the day-to-day lobbying is left to the AIPAC.

One of the ways of approaching Congress that is employed by the Israeli embassy is the organisation of free tours to Israel to learn about the country. The embassy also issues bulletins, known as "pink sheets", which contain an account of the Israeli position.

Although according to the American-Israel Treaty of 1952 Israel is forbidden to engage in political activity within the United States, the Israeli embassy openly uses the American Jewish community to put pressure on the American government. According to Isaiah L. Kenen, the Israeli embassy is "accredited not only to the U.S. government but also, in a sense, to the American Jewish community".⁶ Another Zionist lobbyist, Myer Feldman, declared: "When it talks to the embassy, the government knows it is also talking to a political force in the United States."⁷

The Israeli embassy prefers to keep its lobbying under cover and give the limelight to the American Jewish organisations, but it is the embassy that is undoubtedly in real command. This is shown, for example, by the events that took place in February 1971 during the visit of President Georges Pompidou of France to the United States. The Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations

conducted a noisy campaign against him because of the French government's refusal to sell weapons to Israel and its decision to deliver Mirage fighters to Libya. Most of the pro-Israeli Congressmen were absent from the session of Congress at which Pompidou was due to speak. The Zionist demonstrations reached their zenith during Pompidou's visit to New York. Fearing the worst the White House was forced to appeal to the Israeli embassy for help. The special presidential aide, Leonard Garment, got in touch with the Israeli ambassador, Shlomo Argov, who immediately phoned the Israeli consulate in New York and got an agreement from the Jewish leaders to call off their demonstrations.

It turned out that the matter of the demonstrations against Pompidou had been discussed at a meeting of the Israeli Cabinet two weeks before he visited the United States. The fact that the Israeli embassy required to make only a few telephone calls to get these demonstrations called off shows that similar actions on the part of American Zionists could hardly be carried out without the agreement of the Israeli diplomats.

The Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organisations (CPMAJO), whose members are leaders of 34 Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations, cooperates closely with the AIPAC. The CPMAJO also includes another 6 organisations as "observers". According to Howard M. Squadron, president of the American Jewish Congress and chairman of the CPMAJO from 1980 to 1982, this organisation has two main objectives: "One is to thrash out disagreements among Jewish groups in private, so that adversaries cannot capitalize on them."⁸ This clearly means to give the appearance of monolithic support on the part of all American Jews for the Zionist position. "The second purpose is to serve as a sort of interpreter of Israel's views to American government officials and of American views to Israel."⁹ In fact, the CPMAJO follows the line of the Israeli government virtually without deviating and lobbies for it in the American political arena. As the American bourgeois sociologist, Daniel J. Elazar, noted, this organisation is the "conduit for Israeli government decisions".¹⁰

It is significant that the leaders of the CPMAJO are ready to defend everything Tel Aviv does: the bombing of the nuclear

centre in Iraq in 1981; the annexation of the Golan Heights in December 1981; or even the bloody aggression in Lebanon in the summer and autumn of 1982. Rabbi Julius Berman, who is the current chairman of the CPMAJO and president of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, is fully behind the Israeli government.¹¹

The Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organisations was specially formed in 1955 on the initiative of Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Zionist Organisation, to defend Israel's interests in the US administration. Members of the CPMAJO are also members of the AIPAC Executive Committee which, in turn, is represented at the Conference of Presidents. The lobbying conducted by the CPMAJO mainly takes the form of meetings with the President and the Secretary of State, at which the Conference representatives try to get the necessary pro-Israeli statements on one specific issue or another. Naturally these meetings are also attended by a representative of the AIPAC.

Another lobbying organisation that has close connections with the AIPAC and the CPMAJO is the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, which has a mass base. The NCSJ, which was formed in 1964, played a particularly important role in getting Congress to accept the Jackson-Vanik amendment, although the direct lobbying of Congressmen was done by the AIPAC. During the October War of 1973 the NCSJ put its system of direct contact with the Jewish communities at the disposal of the AIPAC so that the latter was able to spread pro-Israeli propaganda throughout more than 300 American towns and cities.

An important role is also played by the lobbying representations in Washington that are attached to pro-Zionist organisations like B'nai B'rith, which is headed by David Brody, the Anti-Defamation League headed by Herman Edelsberg, and the American Jewish Committee headed by Hyman Bookbinder. The leaders of these representations are on the Executive Committee of the AIPAC, and although occasionally they do lobby independently in Washington, more often than not they work together with the AIPAC.

The Zionist lobby is also connected with a number of legal companies, who defend Israel's interests and play an important

role behind the scenes influencing persons in high places. Among these is the firm of Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver and Kampelman, one of whose partners, Max W. Kampelman, was legislative counsel on Israeli affairs to the late Senator Hubert Humphrey, who himself played one of the leading roles in the pro-Israeli coalition. Another firm, Ginsburg, Feldman and Bress, were from 1949 to 1969 Israel's official legal consultants. "We are still counsel for them," declared David Ginsburg, one of the partners in the firm and an active member of the Zionist movement in the United States. Another partner in the same firm, Myer Feldman, one of the most active "independent" Zionist lobbyists, declared that his functions include "conferring on a regular basis with members of the Israeli government on issues of concern to them in the United States; intervening with people in Congress, when I am asked to, sometimes by people in Israel, more often by leaders of the American Jewish community; getting pro-Israeli ideas across to influential newspaper columnists (Feldman, among other pursuits, has made something of a specialty of representing Washington columnists and editors in his law practice); advising Democratic candidates for office on Middle East issues."¹²

Myer Feldman was a special White House aide during the Kennedy administration. Like him the majority of other Zionist lobbyists have experience of working for the State Department. For instance, Hyman Bookbinder, a representative of the American Jewish Committee, held the post of aide to the director of the Agency for Economic Opportunities and special aide to Vice-President Hubert Humphrey. M. Friedman, a Washington representative of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, was once an aide to Congressman Sol Halpern and later a speech-writer for President Gerald Ford.

An important role in the Zionist lobby at Congress is played by a group of pro-Zionist senatorial and congressional aides and other workers. In January 1975 *The New York Times Magazine* wrote: "Of the dozens of pressure groups that helped influence the United States Government toward adopting the Jackson amendment, the one that probably mattered most was a small, informal steering committee that has never been publicized. This steering committee, identified as 'the Washington group' in a

privately circulated memo written by one of its members last year, was unusual among Washington lobby groups: it included both Congressional aides and lobbyists for an outside pressure group, in this case a committee dedicated to assisting Jews in Russia,"¹³ i.e., the Zionist National Conference on Soviet Jewry.

The "Washington group" has close links with the AIPAC as can clearly be seen by the fact that one of its active members, Morris J. Amitay, who had been legislative assistant to Senator Ribicoff, was made executive director of the AIPAC.

The most active members of the "Washington group" besides Morris J. Amitay at the time when the Jackson-Vanik amendment was being adopted were Richard Perle, Dorothy Fosdick, Tina Silber, Ben Wattenberg—Henry Jackson's aide, and Mark Talisman—administrative assistant to Congressman Charles Vanik. All these worked in Jackson's secretariat. Speaking on the Jackson amendment and on other laws passed to the benefit of Israel, Amitay himself said: "There are now a lot of guys at the working level up here who happen to be Jewish and who are willing to make a little bit of extra effort and to look at certain issues in terms of their Jewishness, and this is what has made this thing go very effectively in the last couple of years. These are all guys who are in a position to make the decisions in these areas for these senators."¹⁴

The methods used by the "Washington group" are attested to, for instance, by the actions of its members in trying to stop Donald M. Kendall, the chairman of Pepsico, Inc., from organising opposition to the Jackson amendment among Big Business circles. When Kendall sent a telegram to the heads of 65 major corporations appealing to them to bury the Jackson-Vanik amendment in committee, he and his associates did not know "that they had a sort of double agent in some of their planning sessions—a person getting paid to lobby for the trade bill who was also, as an individual, sympathetic to the Jackson amendment. Before the Kendall telegram was even sent, this person went home with a copy of the text in his pocket and straight away telephoned Amitay in Ribicoff's office. Amitay, a member of the Washington group, quickly leaked it to *The Washington Post*, which ran the story on page one under the headline: 'Big Firms to Press Hill on Soviet Trade Benefit'. Kendall's telegram, in fact, did draw

some mail to Ways and Means Committee members, but the effect had been sandbagged by publicity.”¹⁵

Another important part of the Zionist lobby in Congress is the group of pro-Zionist Senators and members of the House of Representatives. On March 10, 1975, the *Time* magazine wrote: “The 20 Jews in the House of Representatives are also a potent arm of the Jewish lobby. Their informal leader is Illinois Democrat Sid Yates, in whose office they assemble whenever a legislative emergency affecting Israel is at hand. Each of these Congressmen also operates independently.” This is also borne out by a statement from Bella Abzug, who was elected to Congress in 1973 and who said: “We meet from time to time to consider the concerns of American Jewry—aid to Israel, Soviet Jews, more recently the election. . .”¹⁶ At the present moment in Congress there are 8 Senators and 30 House of Representatives members of Jewish extraction. These include Frank Lautenberg, Senator of New Jersey, a prominent Zionist and president of the United Jewish Appeal.

One of the reasons for the effectiveness of the Zionist lobby in the American Congress consists in its well-organised mechanism for influencing legislation through the electorate, the tactics for which were developed by the American Zionist Emergency Council, the predecessor to the AIPAC. The AZEC in its time sent a number of directives to its local branches instructing them to make contact with their own Congressmen, or visit them in Washington or, preferably, invite them to “small events” whenever they next visited their constituencies. It was also proposed paying special attention to contacts between local political machines. A confidential AZEC memorandum advised “to cultivate the local political leader, who is often a close friend of the Congressman or Senator. That person may be talked to and persuaded to throw the weight of his political influence and power behind our cause. If the office-holder happens to be a member of one party, the other political party should not be neglected. If your Congressman is a Republican, or vice versa, he may be opposed in the next election by a Democrat. The latter prospective candidate should be cultivated.”¹⁷

Pro-Israeli and pro-Zionist pressure on the powers that be in US political life is, however, not only brought to bear through

the structure of professional lobbying. Like Big Business in the United States as a whole the leaders of the American Jewish community widely resort to the use of such an instrument of political influence as contributions to the Democratic and Republican party funds. According to data provided by American researches, the contributions from the Jewish community in the 1970s amounted to nearly 60 per cent of all campaign funds for the Democrats and over 40 per cent of Republican campaign funds.¹⁸ Among the Jewish capitalists there are those who support all currents in American bourgeois political life, from left-wing liberal to ultra-conservative. However, a considerable proportion of the Jewish bourgeoisie use financial levers for exerting pro-Israeli pressure on the politicians. Some of the methods of this behind-the-scenes influencing get reported on occasion in the American press. Thus on March 10, 1975, the *Time* magazine wrote that "any misstatements about Israel as seen from the Jewish perspective can lead to a quick curtailment of a politician's financial support".¹⁹

This support is of particular importance for the Democratic Party, which has traditionally got its financial aid from Zionist and pro-Zionist circles. For example, the Democratic presidential candidate in 1972, George McGovern, lost the support of many of these subscribers, which in no small measure contributed to his crushing defeat at the elections. As it transpired, McGovern had been unable to agree to a confidential meeting with Jewish tycoon, Meshulam Riklis, and a group of Jewish community officials. As one of the leaders of the United Jewish Appeal, Riklis was famous for the many millions of dollars he had poured into the Zionist funds. According to Herbert Alexander, a well-known American specialist on election financing, "when asked his position on Israel by Meshulam Riklis, chairman of the board of the Rapid-American Corporation, McGovern answered that lasting peace could only be accomplished by a negotiated settlement worked out by the United Nations. This position, which was not acceptable to Zionists, cost McGovern the support of some of the Jewish community, even diverting unprecedented resources to Nixon."²⁰

At the same time Riklis and many other Zionist leaders tried unsuccessfully to get Senator Henry Jackson, a prominent Amer-

ican "hawk", elected to the presidency. The finance committee backing Jackson's campaign was headed by Victor Carter, president of the United Jewish Appeal, who collected for the unsuccessful candidate no less than 1.5 million dollars.²¹ The largest donations came from Leon Hess, chairman of the Board of Amerada Hess Oil (225 thousand dollars) and Meshulam Riklis, president of the Rapid-American Corporation (100 thousand), who were both among the leading subscribers to the United Jewish Appeal. Donations to Jackson's campaign also came from Samuel Rothberg, chairman of the Organisation for Distributing Israeli State Loans, and three prominent members of the American Jewish Committee: Ben Sonnenberg; John Loeb, a partner in the New York stockbroking firm of Kuhn, Loeb; and Nathan Lipson, a wealthy industrialist from Atlanta. In his second attempt to gain the presidential candidacy almost 80 per cent of Senator Jackson's funds came from the American Jewish community. The Zionist organisations actively campaigned to support him and in the 1976 primaries part of the Jewish electorate went along with the Zionists and voted for Jackson. In the state of Massachusetts he took 37 per cent of the votes, in Pennsylvania 60 per cent, and in New York an absolute majority of the Jewish vote.²² Nevertheless, his campaign as a whole was a failure and he had to withdraw from the running. But the close ties between Jackson and the Zionist lobby, far from diminishing, have become much stronger.

During the 1980 election campaign donations for the Republican Party candidate, Ronald Reagan, were collected by the same Max Fisher, who was helped by a number of other prominent members of the Jewish bourgeoisie like Walter Annenberg and Alfred Bloomingdale. Donations for the Democratic Party's presidential candidate, Jimmy Carter, were organised among the Jewish community by Robert Strauss, head of the Committee to Re-elect the President, and Ed Sanders, a former president of the AIPAC.

During the mid-1970s the partial state financing of presidential elections was introduced and this to some degree reduced the importance of big donations, which in the past had amounted to hundreds of thousands or even millions of dollars going to one or another candidate, while at the same time increasing the role

of the organisations that brought in relatively small sums. Therefore the network of Jewish "philanthropic" funds, which united the Jewish bourgeoisie, were particularly attractive to the presidential campaign fund-raisers. Before the elections to Congress in 1982 the Zionists set up for the first time a Political Action Committee—an election fund, which openly financed pro-Israeli candidates. In this way large sums were made available for those who opposed the congressional critics of Tel Aviv's policy.

It would be an exaggeration to claim that the donations from the Jewish community alone determine the success of one or another candidate at the elections. In the first place, large sums are donated to these funds by monopoly magnates of non-Jewish extraction. Second, like American Big Business as a whole, the Jewish capitalists pursue a two-party policy, financing both the leading bourgeois parties. But the donations that come from Jewish bourgeois-nationalist circles are used exclusively for the pro-Zionists in the Republican and Democratic parties and against those whose support for Israel is "insufficient".

The definite increase in the influence of the Zionist and pro-Zionist circles in the American political arena has been achieved through manipulation of the "Jewish vote". Zionist propaganda claims that all electors of Jewish extraction vote according to orders from the Zionist centres and in this way can determine the outcome of a presidential election. Jews who take a more active part in elections than other groups of the population are concentrated in certain states that give the largest number of electors of the President. These are California, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, New Jersey, Florida and Massachusetts. These nine states alone give 223 electors, which is almost sufficient to elect the President, since the winner needs only 270 electors. But in New York alone the Jews make up 12 per cent of the population and in the other eight states mentioned above no more than 6 per cent. Therefore their influence at elections is only important when the gap between the two parties is minimal, as it was in the 1960, 1968 and 1976 presidential elections.

Nevertheless, the Jewish vote at elections is noticeable, particularly in the Democratic running at the primaries. The point is that due to the peculiarities of the social composition of the Jewish community, the majority of American Jews have tradition-

ally supported the bourgeois-reformist platform of the Democrats. In the late 1970s, for example, 59 per cent of the Jewish population considered themselves Democrats and only 10 per cent Republicans. Therefore at elections the Democratic Party tries to get maximum support from the Jews, while the Republicans try to split the Jewish vote so as to deprive the Democratic candidates of this advantage. As a result, the candidates try to outdo each other in pro-Zionist, pro-Israeli statements.

However, the Zionists claim that all the Jews vote at elections in a single bloc in the way they are told by the Zionist leaders is a pure myth. Thus, for example, despite the fact that Jimmy Carter made a great fuss about his part in concluding the Camp David deal, he only received the support of 42 per cent of the Jewish electorate. Ronald Reagan only received 35 per cent of the Jewish vote, which was less than in any other group of the white population of the United States. That part of the Jewish vote that the Democrats lost went to the independent liberal candidate, John Anderson. And since the Zionists were supporting Reagan, the results of the voting show convincingly that the majority of American Jews refuse to listen to the appeals of the Zionists. Nevertheless, the myth of the Jewish electoral bloc is accepted by almost all American politicians. Moreover, they even help to encourage it, appealing to the Jewish electorate exclusively from the point of view of the defence of Israel and doing everything else they can that appeals to their nationalist feeling. The quintessence of this position was expressed by President Carter, when he said to a group of Jewish Congressmen who were making pro-Zionist demands at the White House: "I'd rather commit (political) suicide than hurt Israel."²³

The effectiveness of the Zionist lobby can to a certain extent be explained by the extensive use of the tenets and slogans of Zionist propaganda by the media. And this is in no small measure due to the important positions which many of the wealthy Jewish bourgeoisie hold in the media.

Of the 1.7 thousand daily newspapers published in the United States the Jewish bourgeoisie own only slightly more than 3 per cent.²⁴ However, these include the leading papers which have the best coverage, particularly of international affairs. In particular, there is *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*,

which set the tone in the interpretation of foreign affairs. Articles by correspondents for these papers are reprinted daily in hundreds of local papers. Furthermore, the Jewish bourgeoisie owns a number of chain newspapers, the largest of which are controlled by the Newhouse, Sulzberger and Graham families.

The Jewish bourgeoisie also controls the more influential of the weekly magazines like *Newsweek*, *Time* and *U.S. News & World Report*, all of which have enormous circulations, and the so-called "intellectual" weeklies: *Nation*, *New Republic* and *The New York Review of Books*.

In the United States where more people watch TV than read newspapers it is highly significant that the Jewish big bourgeoisie have enormous influence in the country's three largest TV networks: the Columbia Broadcasting System, the American Broadcasting Corporation and the National Broadcasting Corporation. These companies alone do much to form public opinion in the United States, providing as they do 90 per cent of all television news broadcasting which is the main source of information on events taking place throughout the world.

Zionist circles also make extremely effective use of visual material which they support and encourage for television and the cinema. Thus, for example, in spring 1978 a serial production entitled "Holocaust" was shown setting out the Zionist position in relation to the Hitler's annihilation of the Jews. The theme of the film was that the only solution to the Jewish question was the creation of the State of Israel. Exploiting sympathy for the Jewish victims of Nazi genocide, this film did much to encourage pro-Israeli feeling among the American public. In fact a poll conducted after the showing of the film revealed only 39 per cent support for Israel among those who had not seen the show, while among those who had seen the film the figure was 50 per cent. Furthermore, those who had seen only one episode of the film showed 48 per cent support, while those who had seen all three episodes showed 58 per cent support.²⁵

The Zionist propaganda coordinating bodies are highly operative and make use of carefully developed methods for approaching the various groups of American society. Here particular importance is attached to a body which is practically unknown to the public at large, and even to the majority of American

Jews. This body is known as the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council (NJCRAC), which is comprised of national and local Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations.

In the first place, the Special Task Force on Israel attached to the NJCRAC regularly informs local Jewish organisations of its point of view on political events, sets the themes to be covered and point to be made in propaganda and allocates the holding of specific events. Second, every year the leadership of the NJCRAC adopts a Joint Programme Plan which sets out positions on basic questions and issues long-term instructions on establishing links with various groups on the American political scene.

Thus the Joint Programme Plan for 1978-1979 sets out in detail the following methods for approaching individual population groups that have their own special interests:

"The Christian Community. There have been some indications in recent years of greater sensitivity to Israel's position within some major national Christian bodies. Impediments to the taking of pro-Israel positions exist in a number of such bodies... Approaches to individual religious clergy and individual churches and to local church federations have proved more fruitful than working through the major national bodies; and intensification of such approaches is *recommended*.

"Organized Labor. Due to their affinity with the labor movement in Israel, and their anti-Communism, American labor organizations are most outspoken in support of Israel. . .

"The strong stands of the AFL-CIO and the major international unions can be cited and should be effective in enlisting support of local labor leaders for activities in support of Israel.

"Blacks. Because of the general and growing identification of Blacks with the African states, it is most important that the pernicious Arab-Communist charge that Israel is in league with South Africa and sanctions apartheid be demolished. . .

"Women's Organizations. Professional women, businesswomen, women organized along sectarian and denominational lines and for civic, humanitarian and other purposes all exert wide influence going beyond their numbers. Many are active in political affairs, and their impact is growing. Jewish women's organizations have close relationships with other sectarian women's or-

ganizations; many Jewish women are members of non-sectarian women's organizations.

"Numerous opportunities thus exist for the enlistment of women, both individually and through their organizations, in interpretive campaigns.

"Businessmen. They may be expected to be especially responsive to interpretation that emphasizes the contributions that Israel's technical, scientific and commercial know-how could make to a peaceful Middle East and the business opportunities that would ensue.

"Lawyers. Lawyers are frequently named to administrative and other governmental posts, commissions, and the like; they are especially influential in regard to legislation. Jewish lawyers are numerous and prominent in their profession and have large opportunities to influence the opinions of colleagues, clients and others.

"Ethnic Organizations. Some ethnic groups play large roles in shaping opinion, not only among their own members but more widely, and in some localities exercise substantial political power. Many of them may be expected to respond to interpretation based on Israel as a haven for Jews from the Nazi persecutors and more recently oppressive treatment by other governments; and to themes stressing the affinity of American Jews to fellow Jews in the Jewish State."

Thus the Zionist propagandists have worked out methods for approaching various groups among the non-Jewish population, particularly those groups that are politically active. These methods take account of the specific characteristics of each group and the nature of their individual relationships with the Jewish community.

These measures are supplemented by efforts to create the impression of mass support for the policies which the Zionists are trying to implement. For example, a number of secret recommendations by the Special Task Force on Israel under the NJCRAC, which were aimed at the regional branches, indicated six basic directions for propaganda against the Joint Soviet-American Declaration on the Middle East of October 1, 1977.

"1. Regional or Statewide Conferences. Such conferences, if addressed by Senator, key Congressmen, and other news-worthy

public figures such as trade union leaders, top businessmen, ethnic and religious leaders, etc., could provide a strong measure of support for Israel. Extensive media coverage of these events should be arranged in advance.

"2. *Non-Sectarian Delegations.* The delegations should be led by Jewish personalities with political influence but optimally should include a number of prominent non-Jews including trade union leaders. . . We will be sending CRC executives under separate cover lists of mayors, state legislators, district attorneys and attorneys general who have participated in missions to Israel, and who might be willing to participate in such delegations.

"3. *Mail.* It is recommended that there be systematic calendaring of mailings in each community, to assure a steady flow of mail. Each local organization—club, lodge, synagogue, chapter, etc.—agreeing to participate would be assigned certain dates on which its entire membership would be expected to write letters to the White House.

"4. *Local Interpretive Activities.*

"a. In order to reach the largest and most varied audience, we urge communities to have their Speakers Bureau and other knowledgeable local people seek out the largest possible number of local forums including placement of speakers before local service organizations (Rotary, Kiwanis, etc.), trade unions, and the like. Israeli officials are available for such engagements.

"b. Smaller, private meetings by top Jewish leadership with their peer groups in the power structure of the community—businessmen, lawyers, etc.

"c. Placement of speakers on radio and television, as participants in talk shows, etc.

"d. Compilation of mailing lists . . . of opinion molders and decision-makers in the community, and sending them regularly pithy interpretive pieces of literature.

"5. *Op-Ed Pieces.* The writing and placement of effective op-ed pieces prepared by local figures—academics, lawyers, clergymen, or public officials. Placement need not be limited to daily newspapers, but could include weeklies, neighbourhood and ethnic newspapers, etc.

"6. *Letters to the Editor.* A steady flow of such letters should be maintained, particularly from well-known local personal-

ities whose letters are more likely to be published, because of the prominence or prestige of the writers."

This extensive range of propagandist activities allows the Zionists to exert effective influence on the media and thus on public opinion. However, the main reason for the success of this campaign consists in the fact that the Zionist line is fully in accord with US imperialist strategy. In a situation in which the Zionist approach coincides with that of other reactionary forces on the US political scene their basic propaganda theses are also used by the overwhelming majority of the US mass media.

Although the majority of American Jews hold liberal views on many questions of US domestic and foreign policy, the Zionist lobby maintains increasingly close contacts with the most reactionary circles and primarily the military-industrial complex.

The Pentagon and the State Department realise the importance of the Zionist lobby in Congress and frequently use their services to get bills in the interest of the military-industrial complex through Congress. It is well known, for example, that the administration used the help of the Zionist lobby to get congressional approval for military aid to Turkey. But it is less well known that Zionist circles played an important role in providing billions of dollars worth of arms to the Shah's regime in Iran. Thus, when discussion was taking place on the sale to Iran of the AWACS aerial reconnaissance system, Assistant Secretary of State, Douglas J. Bennett, sent a memorandum under a "limited official use" security classification requesting that they should "mobilize Israeli lobby in support of strategy".²⁶

Zionist circles have allied themselves with the military-industrial complex and with the Carter administration's rejection of international detente in favour of the cold war. Thus on December 14, 1979, a meeting was held between the US Defence Secretary, Harold Brown, and a "delegation of leaders of the Jewish community." According to *The Jerusalem Post*, the delegation supported the military budget programme as proposed by the Pentagon. The meeting was arranged by the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs, whose director, Steven Bryen, was an active member of the "Washington group". Previously he had been Chief of Staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee,

but had been forced to leave Congress after it had been revealed in the press that he had passed secret information from the Pentagon to the Israeli secret service. Bryen then headed the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs which was set up in 1977 and which had two main objectives: to keep the American public informed of the geopolitical value of Israel to the United States as an outpost of Western interests in the Middle East; and to inform the American Jewish community of the importance of American defence for both the United States and Israel. Thus, essentially, the purpose of the organisation is the strengthening of the military-strategic basis of American-Israeli relations.

Representatives of Jewish bourgeois-nationalist circles are broadly represented in organisations that act in support and on behalf of the military-industrial complex. Thus the general director of the notorious Committee on the Present Danger, Professor Eugene Rostow, was a former deputy to the Secretary of State under Lyndon Johnson, and the legislative counsel, Marx Kampelman, was a partner in the law firm of Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver and Kampelman and one of the directors of the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs. Kampelman was one of the main fund raisers for the unsuccessful presidential candidacy campaigns of Hubert Humphrey and Henry Jackson. Other members of this odious anti-Soviet organisation include Rita Hauser, a partner in the law firm of Strook, Strook and Lavan and an active member of a number of Zionist organisations, who played an important role in the electoral campaigns of Richard Nixon in 1972 and Gerald Ford in 1976; Sol Chaikin, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and one of the leaders of the Jewish Labour Committee; Norman Podhoretz, editor of *Commentary*, which is published by the American Jewish Committee; Elmo Zumwalt, a former naval chief of staff; Charles Saltzman, a partner in the firms of stock-brokers, Goldman, Sachs and Co., and many other influential persons of pro-Zionist views. But the representatives of the Jewish community leadership are only one of the groups that form the Committee on the Present Danger, which is made of persons who cover the whole spectrum of American reaction. But their active participation in this kind of organisation shows once more the specific role of the Zionist and pro-Zionist circles in the anti-So-

viet campaigns that are conducted by the military-industrial complex.

The main directions for the anti-Soviet activity of the Zionists and the methods used by the Zionist lobby are clearly revealed in the campaign they launched against the Joint Soviet-American Declaration on the Middle East of October 1, 1977, which opened the way to cooperation between the two countries as con-chairmen of the Geneva Peace Conference in achieving a just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East conflict. On October 3 the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith accused the administration of helping to "strengthen Soviet influence" in the Middle East. On October 12 the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council circulated among its member organisations the following "Guide to Action" as part of a campaign against the provisions of the Joint Declaration:

- "—Convene regional or statewide conferences, following adjournment of Congress, keynoted by congressional spokesmen.

- "—Send delegation including non-Jewish public figures to Washington, D. C., to meet with Senators and Congressmen before adjournment.

- "—Systematize assured continuation of massive flow of letters to White House in coming weeks.

- "—Stimulate preparation and placement of op-ed pieces by academicians and others with expertise on the Middle East.

- "—Maintain steady stream of letters to editor, particularly from prominent local figures."

The report of the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council of November 2, 1977 noted that measures against the Joint Declaration had been taken in 292 towns and cities. AIPAC instructions to local organisations issued on November 10 set the following objectives: "(1) continue and intensify criticism of the administration's policies particularly with the help of Congressmen. (2) strengthen and coordinate efforts to increase support from non-Jewish sources like religious, trade union, ethnic and other organizations; (3) send replies on behalf of Jewish and non-Jewish representatives to papers, whose editors have expressed doubts about the position of the American Jewish community and its entitlement to raise the present issue." The Executive of the American Jewish Committee de-

clared that among the American friends of Israel a crisis of faith had occurred in the Middle East policy of the administration. A series of meetings between members of the administration took place with the leaders of Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations that had attacked the administration for "taking the Russian point of view". The Joint Declaration was resolutely opposed by the Israeli government.

The result of the pressure campaign was that many of the top administration personnel began to panic. "We don't want a public confrontation with the Jewish community over the Middle East," said Jody Powell, the presidential press secretary, for "this could be the biggest, most sensitive political problem we face in 1980."²⁷ Within a few days the administration renounced the position it had taken vis-à-vis the Joint Soviet-American Declaration and adopted a directly opposite policy that was aimed at encouraging a separate Egyptian-Israeli deal.

But this change in Washington's policy was not only due to the Zionists. The Joint Declaration was also opposed by all reactionary forces in the United States that were against cooperation of any kind with the Soviet Union. Henry Jackson, the late George Meany, formerly head of the AFL-CIO, the Committee on the Present Danger, émigré organisations, the leaders of the Republican Party and some Democratic faction leaders in Congress all opposed Soviet-American cooperation in settling the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Joint Soviet-American Declaration gave rise to protests not only from the Israeli regime, but also from the Egyptian President, Anwar Sadat. And even the leaders of the US administration were far from being whole-hearted supporters of a Geneva Peace Conference with all interested parties being represented. For Jimmy Carter the Declaration was only another zigzag in his policies, which ultimately ended in open confrontation with the Soviet Union in late 1979 and early 1980. Thus the action of the Zionist lobby against the Joint Declaration took place against a broad anti-Soviet campaign and a planned change in the US administration's policy.

The Zionist lobby is aimed in the first instance at providing maximum political, economic and military support for ruling circles in Israel. The Zionist lobbyists stress that this is fully in accordance with the strategic interests of American imperialism

in the Middle East. As the American-Israeli historian, Nadav Safran, noted, "within the new framework of joint American-Israeli diplomatic-strategic interests, the combination of Jewish interests in and general American sympathy for Israel attained its maximum effectiveness".²⁸ American Zionists always act according to the policies of the ruling class in the United States, which ensures them the support not only of the nationalist sections of the Jewish big bourgeoisie, but of other US monopoly capitalist groups as well. In supporting the aggressive line of Tel Aviv, Washington is trying primarily to inflict defeat upon the national liberation forces in the Middle East and thus strengthen its own positions in that area. This is the reason why the Zionist lobby, which defends the interests of Israel, is supported by both bourgeois parties in America together with Congress and the administration. It is also the reason why in the United States the Zionist lobby has allied itself to the military-industrial complex, which heads the coalition of all those in America who oppose detente and desire a return to the cold war.

The State of Israel today is the largest receiver of American economic and military aid. This aid was sharply increased after the October War of 1973, when the United States had to ship arms urgently to Israel to save the aggressors from defeat. In all, between 1949 and 1983 Israel received almost 26 billion dollars worth of aid, approximately half of which was given freely. This is considerably in excess of the ten billion dollars which Israel received during the same period from the Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations among the American Jewish community.²⁹ Furthermore, it is not only the American Jewish bourgeoisie that gives donations to these organisations or buys Israeli state bonds. For instance, the United Jewish Appeal regularly receives large sums from the Rockefellers, W. Milliken and other non-Jewish monopoly capitalists.

Of course, Washington's help for Tel Aviv is not given entirely unselfishly. According to General George J. Keegan, formerly Chief of Air Force Intelligence, for every dollar the United States gives Israel, it gets back a thousand. Professor William B. Quandt, who from 1977 to 1979 was Office Director for Middle Eastern Affairs on the National Security Council Staff, noted that "the United States would not spend billions of dol-

lars in military and economic aid merely out of a sense of moral obligation or because of the pressures of 2 per cent of its population". He then went on to set out the real motives involved: "Israel must be a strategic asset to the United States, and its power must be capable of counterbalancing Soviet influence. According to this concept, Israel is the only reliable ally of the United States in the area. In extremis, Israel could use its power to protect United States interests, perhaps even offering bases for American military operations. Under less dire circumstances, Israel was valuable as an anti-Soviet bastion in a sea of radical Arab states."³⁰

Support for Israel's aggressive policy and the causes of this support can clearly be seen in the workings of the American Congress, where the pro-Israeli coalition amounts to 75-80 per cent of all Senators and 60-70 per cent of the members of the House of Representatives. But it is interesting to note that the representatives of pro-Zionist circles that have direct connections with the Zionist lobby form only one of the elements of this coalition, which also includes Democrats, Republicans, Liberals, Conservatives, northerners and southerners. For many years both houses of Congress have approved requests for many billions from the administration for aid to Israel without any long discussion, and in certain circumstances they have even granted additional amounts. The pro-Israeli coalition of Senators and Congressmen has brought pressure to bear on the White House and appealed to the President to be more open in support of Israeli extremists. Thus in 1970 this coalition opposed the diplomatic manoeuvring of the Nixon administration and its proposed "Rogers Plan" and called upon the US government to take the side of Israel which to all intents and purposes rejected the plan. At the same time Israeli supporters in Congress called for Phantoms and other military hardware to be sent to Israel. Then again in 1975 this same coalition opposed the Ford's administration's widely advertised intention to "review" American policy in the Middle East and demanded that "Israeli military might" should be left untouched. In July 1978, on the eve of the Camp David deal, the Senate adopted by 87 votes 13 abstentions a resolution which stressed that "support for a strong and secure Israel and the maintenance for this purpose of Israel's effective defense

capabilities as essential to peace remains a fundamental tenet of United States foreign policy".³¹

At the same time after the October War of 1973 dissension appeared among US ruling circles on the tactics of American imperialist policy in the Middle East, though the essential strategic goals for that region remained the same. This dissension was reflected in the debates that were held in the spring of 1978 over the declared intention of the Carter administration to sell a package of military planes to Israel, Saudi Arabia and Egypt. The Israeli government and the Zionist lobbyists in Washington interpreted the "package deal" as an encroachment upon the privileged place of Tel Aviv in the US Middle Eastern policy.

The Zionist lobby tried to block the sale of arms of the Arabs who were seen to be competing with them for the role of main US client in the Middle East and get Congress to ban it. On April 20, 1978, the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, a Zionist-controlled coordinating centre for the American Jewish community, sent a memorandum to its various organisations that all in all comprise some 4 million people. This memorandum contained a demand for "*beginning immediately a massive* all-out effort to have Congress disapprove the arms sales to Saudi Arabia and Egypt. To that end, generate the largest possible volume of letters and telegrams to Congress members, especially members of the House International Relations Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee." It was further recommended that the following groups be involved in this campaign: "(a) the Jewish community, (b) influentials, including political figures, (c) special interest groups including clergy, labor, veterans, ethnics, etc., and (d) the media."

However, this time, as distinct from the campaign against the Joint Soviet-American Declaration, the position of the Zionist lobby was not supported by other influential groups from among the American ruling class. As a result, the pro-Israeli coalition in Congress was split and for the first time in many years a resolution that the Zionists had been trying to get through was rejected by 55 votes to 44. Thus Congress upheld the desire of the Carter administration to form an alliance of all reactionary forces in the Middle East, including Israel and the conservative Arab regimes, under the aegis of the United States. And on this

basis, despite resistance from the Zionist lobbyists and opposition from Tel Aviv, Washington got through its "package deal". But this action was far from meaning US imperialist support for the Arab peoples, as the bourgeois press would have it. In fact, the "package deal" was only another step in the policy of encouraging Begin and Sadat to form a bloc against the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples.

After the signing of the separate Egyptian-Israeli treaty in Washington in March 1979, the White House, in its desire for the closest possible cooperation with the Zionists, tried to frustrate the attempts of Carter's opponents in the Democratic Party to use the financial and political potential of the Jewish community for a "revolt" against the President.

The head of the American delegation at the separate Egyptian-Israeli talks on "Palestinian autonomy", Robert Strauss, was chosen particularly for his contacts with the Jewish community leaders. At the same time he ran the section of the United Jewish Appeal that dealt with collecting donations from government employees, and during the talks he had regular meetings with the Zionist lobby leaders to work out a common stance. He publicly declared "logical" Begin's approach, who refused to recognise the need for a Palestinian state and who desired to put the occupied territories under permanent Israeli control. In a speech to the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organisations, Strauss assured everyone present that President Carter was devoted to the cause of the State of Israel like a Zionist.

In late 1979 Strauss left his diplomatic post and headed the committee for the re-election of Carter and Mondale. At the same time Ed Sanders became director of that section of the committee that dealt with the election campaign in the West Coast states.

Nevertheless, the majority of Jewish Americans, despite the virtual alliance between the White House and the Zionist lobby, did not show a great deal of enthusiasm for Jimmy Carter. In the New York primaries 80 per cent of Jewish Democrats voted against Carter. But the outcome of the election was influenced (apart from the usual factors) by a scandal which was caused by the American delegation's voting in the UN.

To recall the events, the head of the US delegation to the UN, Andrew Young, was forced to resign for holding a meeting with the PLO representative, which had not been sanctioned by the President. The fact of this meeting was discovered by Israeli intelligence and Tel Aviv and the American Zionist organisations came out with sharp protests. Using this as a pretext, the administration was able to rid itself of a man who was considered far too independent, thus bringing about a crisis in relations between the Blacks and the Jews, traditional allies in American internal politics. In this way the President tried not only to get additional dividends from the Zionists but to frustrate the attempts of Edward Kennedy to form an electoral bloc of Blacks, Jews and other ethnic communities against Carter. Ronald Reagan's accession to power brought no fundamental changes in relations between the White House, Congress, Zionist circles and the Zionist lobby.

A large number of Zionist lobby supporters were given appointments to important posts in the Reagan administration. One of the most prominent of these was Richard Perle, Assistant Defence Secretary. As legislative assistant to the notorious Senator Henry Jackson, he controlled for many years the Zionist lobbyists in the US Congress and got through many anti-Soviet, pro-Israeli bills on Capitol Hill. It is no accident that the present US administration has been called the "most pro-Israeli" government since the formation of the State of Israel. But as had happened during the Carter administration at the time of the "package deal", once the Zionist lobby tried to oppose the strategic position of the White House it was defeated. Thus the Reagan administration passed through Congress the sale of AWACS aircraft to Saudi Arabia, expecting that this new "prestigious" weapon would encourage pro-American feeling at the Saudi court, which was an essential element in the White House's plans for strategic cooperation between Israel and the conservative regimes in the Middle East, cooperation that would be based on opposition to the Soviet Union and conducted under American aegis. The Zionist lobby launched an active campaign against this deal, which had given rise to extreme indignation in Tel Aviv. Primarily they claimed that the sale of AWACS planes would upset the military balance in favour of the Arabs and

create a threat to Israel's security. However, the Senate rejected the demands of the Zionist lobbyists by 52 votes to 48, even though Begin and other Israeli leaders had specially visited the United States to take part in the campaign against the AWACS planes.

Certain persons in the Arab world and even among the Zionists declared that the sale of AWACS planes to the Saudis represented a turning point in US Middle East policy, even a rejection of its former pro-Israeli line. This is completely wrong. In the first place, the AWACS aircraft virtually remain under full US control although the Saudis have to pay for them in cash. Second, this is a system that is designed not for the defence of Saudi Arabia from an Israeli invasion, but for the setting up of a regional structure of command and communication for the US armed force to be deployed, according to the Pentagon's plans, in the Middle East. Third, the sale of AWACS aircraft does not change the balance of forces in the area between Israel and the Arabs, since Washington generously compensates Tel Aviv with new deliveries of the most up-to-date US military technology. But the most convincing proof that Washington's pro-Israeli policy has remained unchanged is the encouragement that the United States has given to Israeli aggression against Lebanon, where Tel Aviv has been waging fascist-style genocide against the Palestinians.

The Israeli invasion of Lebanon in summer 1982 was the result of "strategic cooperation" between the Reagan administration and the Begin government against the Arab national liberation movement. The Zionist lobbyists spent considerable effort to strengthen and consolidate the US-Israeli military and political alliance. The Reagan administration was receptive to the idea of concluding a formal agreement with the Israeli government. As Isaiah L. Kenen, the founder and a former director of the AIPAC, wrote with some satisfaction, "the Reagan Administration . . . does not exclude Israel because it recognizes that Israel is a strategic asset—the strongest anti-Communist regime in the Middle East".³² As a result, in December 1981 a memorandum was signed in Washington on American-Israeli "strategic cooperation" which bore a clearly anti-Soviet bias. With US support the Zionist leadership in Israel immediately began a

new escalation of the tension in the Middle East, annexing the Golan Heights which belong to Syria. In the spring of 1982 the Israeli authorities on the occupied West Bank unilaterally introduced a "civilian administration", which was a new form of repression for the Arab population living there. These actions on the part of the Israeli extremists were fully supported by the Zionist lobbyists in Washington. Even the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in June 1982 was called by them "a defensive measure". The AIPAC and the CPMAJO called upon the Reagan administration to undertake the defence of the Israeli aggressors, who had butchered tens of thousands of Lebanese and Palestinian citizens.

Nevertheless, the so-called "Reagan Plan" which was proposed by the United States in autumn 1982 and which was immediately rejected by the Israeli government, faced the Zionist lobbyists with a dilemma. Open action against the "Reagan Plan" would counterpose the Zionist lobby not only to the present US administration, which has been called the most pro-Israeli in all history, but also to its Zionist allies among the other reactionary groups of the US ruling class. The lessons of the "package deal" and the sale of the AWACS aircraft show that without the support of the White House and the lobbyists of the military-industrial complex the Zionists could not be successful. At the same time it would be unthinkable for the Zionist lobbyists to oppose official Tel Aviv policy: their whole effort is directed towards defending the policy of the Israeli government.

As a result, there has been some confusion among the Zionist lobbyists. The present AIPAC director, Thomas Dine, supported the "Reagan Plan" with reservations and tried to disassociate himself from the rigid position of the Begin government. A similar position was also adopted by representatives of such leading pro-Zionist organisations as the B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Committee. But Rabbi Julius Berman, the new chairman of the CPMAJO and president of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, and Howard Squadron, president of the American Jewish Congress, protested to the White House.

The position of the Zionist lobby in Washington was also influenced by the fact that the "Reagan Plan" was supported by

the most powerful opposition party in Israel, the Labour Party, whose leader, Shimon Peres, met President Reagan in the White House in late August 1982. The position of the Labour Party "legitimatised" the criticisms of Begin in the American Jewish community and also among the leadership of the World Jewish Congress. Also important were the mass demonstrations in Israel itself against the bloodshed that was going on in Beirut on Begin's and Sharon's orders.

The differences between the Israeli government and the Reagan administration did not, however, affect the anti-Soviet and anti-Arab principles of US-Israeli cooperation. The White House still refuses to recognise the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. It tries to foist upon them its so-called "settlement" of the Middle East conflict, by which the Israeli Zionists and the Arab reactionaries would join together under the aegis of the United States. Furthermore, Washington still gives Tel Aviv enormous military and economic aid and accords it diplomatic protection in the UN Security Council.

In these conditions the Zionist lobbyists try to iron out the tactical differences between the United States and Israel so as to further strengthen the American-Israeli strategic alliance. They ensure the maintenance of pro-Israeli orientation in the policy of the Reagan administration and demand increased aid for Israel. At the same time the Zionist lobby calls upon the Israeli government to take fuller account of Washington's interests and to show greater compliancy towards the White House's diplomatic initiatives. As before the objective of the Zionist lobbyists remains the maximum coordination of Israeli and US policy.

Thus the Zionist lobby in Washington plays an extremely important role in the workings of the US-Israeli alliance. The lobbyists guarantee the stability of American-Israeli relations and ensure continuity in the policies of the various administrations towards Israel. To a certain degree they restrict Washington's room for manoeuvre in its Middle East policy. Zionist pressure turns American-Israeli relations into something that affects not only the foreign but also the domestic policy of the United States.

It should, however, be emphasised that the effectiveness of

the Zionist lobby is determined not only by the important political levers which it holds itself, but also by the support which it receives from the main groups among the US ruling class. The Zionist lobby holds to a policy which accords with the interests of American imperialism. Representatives of the military-industrial complex have become the allies of the Zionists in the US political arena. Without the support of other anti-communist and anti-Soviet groups the Zionist lobby could not ensure that a pro-Israeli policy would be pursued by the United States. The American-Israeli partnership is an expression of the alliance between American imperialism and international Zionism in their struggle against the socialist community and the working-class and national liberation movements.

References

1. Robert Silverberg, *If I Forget Thee, O Jerusalem: American Jews and the State of Israel*, Pyramid Books, New York, 1972, p. 246.
2. *Congressional Quarterly*, August 22, 1981, p. 1524.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *The New York Times*, August 8, 1975, p. 2.
5. *Time*, Vol. 105, No. 10, March 10, 1975, p. 29.
6. *National Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 2, January 8, 1972, p. 67.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Congressional Quarterly*, August 22, 1981, p. 1525.
9. *Ibid.*
10. Daniel J. Elazar, *Community and Polity. The Organizational Dynamics of American Jewry*, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1976, p. 224.
11. See *The New York Times*, September 10, 1982.
12. *National Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 2, January 8, 1972, pp. 66, 67, 71.
13. *The New York Times Magazine*, January 5, 1975, p. 17.
14. Stephen D. Isaacs, *Jews and American Politics*, Doubleday and Co., Inc., Garden City, New York, 1974, pp. 255-56.
15. *The New York Times Magazine*, January 5, 1975, p. 26.
16. Harry Golden, *Travels Through Jewish America*, Doubleday

- day and Co., Inc., Garden City, New York, 1973, p. 147.
17. Robert Silverberg, *Op. cit.*, pp. 247-48.
 18. Russell W. Howe and Sarah H. Trott, *The Power Peddlers. How Lobbyists Mold America's Foreign Policy*, Doubleday and Co., Inc., Garden City, New York, 1977, p. 283
 19. *Time*, March 10, 1975, p. 28.
 20. Herbert E. Alexander, *Financing the 1972 Election*, Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Co., Lexington, Massachusetts, 1976, p. 295.
 21. *Ibid.*, pp. 173, 183.
 22. See *American Jewish Year Book 1978*, Vol. 78, The American Jewish Committee, New York, 1977, p. 80.
 23. Harvey Sicherman, *Broker or Advocate? The U.S. Role in the Arab-Israeli Dispute 1973-1978*, Foreign Policy Research Institute, Philadelphia, 1978, p. 113.
 24. See A. Lilienthal, *The Zionist Connection. What Price Peace?*, Dodd, Mead and Co., New York, 1978, p. 225.
 25. See Michael C. Hudson and Ronald G. Wolfe (Eds.), *The American Media and the Arabs*, Center for Contemporary Arab Studies, George Town University, Washington, 1980, p. 21.
 26. *The Washington Post*, September 10, 1977.
 27. *The New York Times*, October 30, 1977, p. 34.
 28. Nadav Safran, *Israel: The Embattled Ally*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1978, p. 577.
 29. See *Israel and American Jewish Interaction. Report of an International Task Force*, The American Jewish Committee, New York, 1978, p. 27.
 30. William B. Quandt, *Decade of Decisions. American Policy Toward the Arab-Israeli Conflict, 1967-1976*, University of California Press, Berkeley, California, 1977, p. 12.
 31. *Congressional Record*, Vol. 124, No. 114, July 26, 1978, pp. 11843, 11844.
 32. Isaiah L. Kenen, *Israel's Defense Line. Her Friends and Foes in Washington*, Prometheus Books, Buffalo, New York, 1981, p. 332.

T. Znamenskaya

AMERICAN NEOCONSERVATISM AND THE JEWISH ESTABLISHMENT

There have, of course, been no lack of doctrines throughout the history of American socio-political thought to show the way for the "affluent society" to become even more affluent. Nevertheless, all these numerous ideas that have derived from the overworked brains of bourgeois ideologists have in fact always vacillated between the liberal and the conservative. In the mid-1970s, however, a new social doctrine came into being that was intended by its authors to overcome the deficiencies of the traditional liberalism and conservatism. This was called "neoconservatism".

Neoconservatism arose as a reaction to disillusionment with the "liberalism" of the Democratic Party. In domestic policy, on the one hand, it was based on the old liberal principle of governmental control over the economy and, on the other, on the conservative principle of free enterprise and reduced federal expenditure on social needs. The main postulate of neoconservatism was the demand for greater freedom for Big Business and reduced federal control over the corporations. In foreign policy neoconservatism was marked by militant anti-Sovietism and interventionism. In the words of American sociology professor, Peter Berger, one of the ideologists of neoconservatism, "the foremost political as well as moral task of the US in the contemporary world must be resistance to the expansion of the Soviet system".¹

Thus neoconservatism is a right-wing bourgeois-conformist trend in American politics, the ideology of which is composed of a rather eclectic selection of, on the one hand, old liberal principles and, on the other, conservative views. In essence, neoconservatism, upholding as it does the interests of influential industrial circles in the United States and the American

political elite, is not in any way new, either as a socio-political doctrine or an ideology.

Alarmed at the enormous upsurge of mass left-wing movements in the late 1960s and early 1970s, a section of the American liberals went further to the right. The fact that many former liberals are now reactionary conformists shows how deep runs the conservative infrastructure of American liberalism.

It is, therefore, hardly surprising that the American former liberal and now conservative sociologist, Seymour Lipset, declared in a speech delivered at a symposium which was arranged by the *Commentary* magazine (published by the American Jewish Committee) and entitled "Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy": "The neoconservatives are largely liberals and Social Democrats who view communism in the same threatening terms as do most conservatives. Sensing, rationally or emotionally, that their liberal co-ideologists on economic and domestic issues are undermining the defense of democracy abroad, they find bases for alliance with conservatives on issues of foreign and defense policy and human rights."² From Lipset's thesis it is clear that the alliance between the US right-wingers and those who were once American liberals is based on anti-Sovietism, anti-communism and the strengthening of US military might in the face of the "Soviet threat" and "communist expansion". And this kind of foreign policy also has its internal objectives which amount to diverting the American people from the real economic and social problems that face their country and uniting the numerous and often mutually antagonistic social groups in the face of a "threat from without".

In an article entitled "The Future Danger" Norman Podhoretz, one of the most active proponents of neoconservatism in recent years and a member of the pro-Zionist wing of the Jewish establishment, tried to scare his readers with the threat of Soviet expansion and communist infiltration into areas of the world that are vital to the West. Calling upon Americans to reject any talks and contracts with the USSR, Podhoretz said: "The conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union is a clash between two civilizations. More accurately, it is a clash between civilization and barbarism. What makes the Soviet Union barbaric is, precisely, communism."³ Hence the con-

clusion that the fight against communism is a "fight for freedom". Consequently all acts on the part of American imperialism against the socialist countries, including the Vietnam War, constitute, in Podhoretz's opinion, absolute good.

Furthermore, the "struggle against communism" has become a banner under which the most anti-democratic, barbarian regimes, as exist, for example, in Chile and El Salvador, are maintained and justified. "We are for freedom," continues Podhoretz, "which is why we should prefer authoritarian regimes of the Right to the totalitarian states of the Communist World."⁴ Thus the neoconservative understanding of the word "freedom" includes freedom to repress and combat any progressive, democratic movement and, of course, freedom for Big Business.

Within the framework of the new doctrine, even the much vaunted concept of American democracy itself has undergone some revision. Glorifying the freedom of the individual has now been replaced with the demand to crush intellectual life, if the latter in any way deviates from the "interests of society", i.e., the interests of the American ruling elite. Individual freedom is encouraged only in the sphere of Big Business as the private initiative of entrepreneurs.

The emergence in American social and political life of a doctrine like neoconservatism with its propagandist myths about the "threat from without" or "communist expansion" and its calls for "strong government" reveals a move towards consolidation of all right-wing trends and factions in the United States. With the aid of political demagoguery the ruling industrial-administrative nucleus of the American elite is trying to further strengthen its social and political positions within the country.

* * *

Among the neoconservatives there are many Jewish intellectuals who are directly or indirectly connected with the leadership of the Jewish community and Zionist circles in the United States. It is enough to name such prominent theoreticians of neoconservatism as Norman Podhoretz, editor of *Commentary*, Milton Himmelfarb, the journalist, Irving Kristol, a well-known political commentator and editor of *The Public Interest* maga-

zine, Walter Laqueur, a bourgeois historian, sociologists Daniel Bell, Nathan Glazer, Seymour Lipset and Daniel Boorstin, philosopher Sidney Hook, writers Sol Bellow and Lionel Trilling, who are all at the same time leaders of the Jewish community in America. On the neoconservative platform they form a bloc with such influential members of the American establishment as Senator Daniel P. Moynihan, Professor Zbigniew Brzezinski and the US Ambassador to the United Nations, Jeane Kirkpatrick.

But it is Jewish intellectuals, particularly the most privileged among them, that form a large percentage of neoconservatives. These include the professorial and teaching staff at the older American universities as well as journalists, sociologists, political analysts and economists. In our view, one of the reasons for this swing to the right among the Jewish intelligentsia and its entry into the neoconservative camp is its rising living standards and social position in political and intellectual life in the United States. Jewish Americans head, or at least take an active part in the publication of such respectable socio-political magazines as *Newsweek*, *The New York Review of Books* and *New Republic*.

According to *The New York Times*, ten per cent of teachers at universities and colleges (at Harvard this figure is as high as 30 per cent), twelve per cent sociologists and 12.6 per cent of political analysts are of Jewish extraction. Among the artistic intelligentsia this percentage is somewhat lower—7.5 per cent, but on the other hand they do include such major Jewish writers as Nobel Prize winner Sol Bellow, Arthur Miller, Bernard Malamud, and Philip Roth who have through their works considerable influence on the attitudes of their readers.

The neoconservative wing of the Jewish intelligentsia is largely found among the most respectable sections of American society and forms the so-called “upper crust of the middle class”. Its influence on the whole of American society which is spread by the media is a constant object of attention by the bourgeois, including Zionist, ideologists, who try to turn prominent Jewish intellectuals into conduits of their ideas.

The Zionist propaganda about “solidarity with Israel”, “the community of American and Israeli interests” and the “special

relationship" between the United States and Israel and the encouragement of Jewish bourgeois nationalism is completely in accord with the neoconservative foreign policy of the American ruling elite from which it receives wholehearted support.

According to the American Jewish sociologist, Charles Kadushin, 30 per cent of the American (including the Jewish American) intellectual elite has direct business contacts with the government, i.e., in one way or another serves the authorities.⁵

This shows the great economic and social dependence of part of the Jewish intelligentsia on the American establishment, which is the reason why it functions so often as the latter's apologist and ideologically justifies the economic and political line of the US government. The fact that neoconservative attitudes among American Jewish intellectuals depend on their social position was shown clearly at the 1980 presidential election. According to ABC and CBS, two of the largest American broadcasting corporations, 34 per cent of the Jewish electorate with an annual income of \$10,000 voted for Reagan, 41 per cent with an income of \$30,000 and 47 per cent with an income of \$50,000 and above.

The fact that the privileged section of the Jewish intellectual elite has adopted the platform of the neoconservatives is shown by a symposium entitled "Liberalism and the Jews" that was held in January 1980 by the *Commentary* magazine. Taking part in the symposium were such well-known public figures as Daniel Bell, Seymour Lipset, editor of the liberal magazine *Dissent* Irving Howe, philosopher Sidney Hook and others. At the symposium attitude to 1) the "affirmative action" programme, i.e., the quotas assessed for the national minorities to obtain work and enter higher educational institutions and 2) to the Palestinian problem was the criterion for determining to which wing (liberal or conservative) individual representatives of American Jewry belonged. Forty-nine of the 52 participants at the symposium expressed complete solidarity with the conservatives. They sharply criticised the former US representative to the United Nations, Andrew Young, for having contacts with the representative of the PLO, which was described as a "terrorist organisation", and also criticised the "affirmative action" pro-

gramme, which provided some benefits for the Negroes and other national minorities.

At the same time the majority of participants came out in support of the government programme to reduce federal spending on social needs and provide greater freedom for the major industrial corporations. The platform of the symposium virtually reflected the interests of Big Business and the Jewish big bourgeoisie and completely ignored the needs of broad sections of the US Jewish population.

Conservative attitudes among the Jewish population and the American population as a whole are considerably encouraged by Zionist bourgeois propaganda. Zionist and pro-Zionist circles in the Jewish establishment, which are closely bound up with the American ruling elite, uphold the interests not only of the Jewish bourgeoisie, but of the ruling class as a whole in its struggle against the progressive, democratic trends in American social and political life. Zionist propaganda has increasingly blown up the myth of a "Soviet military threat", of "the persecution of the Jews in the USSR", of a "left-wing plot" and of "Palestinian terrorists" trying to "destroy Israel".

Anti-Sovietism is one of the main trends in US foreign policy and ideology today. The myth of the Soviet military threat has united the hands of the Pentagon and US military-industrial complex. In encouraging this myth of communist expansion internally bourgeois propaganda helps the forces of reaction to fight against the progressive movements in the country and at the same time justifies the need for "strong government", i.e., the power of influential industrial and political circles in the USA. In the name of "saving the Soviet Jews" Zionist propaganda inculcates the idea among American Jews that anti-Semitism is inherent in the socialist system and this strikes at left-wing progressives within the Jewish community.

Anti-Sovietism and anti-communism are the main elements of Zionist ideology and they connect it with American neoconservatism.

Apart from cold-war style anti-Sovietism and anti-communism, Zionist and neoconservative interests in US foreign policy also coincide in their unconditional support for Israel. The Zionist-neoconservative credo in foreign policy was briefly ex-

pounded by Isidore Silver, professor of constitutional law and history at the City University of New York and an influential figure in the American Jewish community. He believes that "while eschewing 'morals' in foreign policy, neoconservatives espouse two nonpragmatic duties of the United States-Israel must be preserved and protected and Soviet Jews must be free to dissent or, if necessary, emigrate. Only a military powerful America can achieve these goals."⁶

Support for Israel and the strengthening of its political influence in the Middle East accords with the interests of both US ruling circles and the Zionist leadership and the leaders of the Jewish communities, who use "Israel-centrism" as a means of uniting the politically and socially heterogeneous Jewish community. "Israel-centrism" today and the material and political support which the State of Israel receives from the Jewish community in the United States serve to inflame Jewish nationalism.

The second "nonpragmatic" duty of the neoconservatives, as proclaimed by Silver, which is to "defend the rights of Soviet Jews" supposedly suppressed in the USSR, is designed to discredit the Soviet system, unite the Jewish community on the basis of fear and hatred of the USSR and socialism and at the same time deal with the democratic, progressive groups within the Jewish community itself.

In this connection it is hardly surprising that neoconservative ideology implies a kind of renaissance of American nationalism. Norman Podhoretz, one of the ideologists of neoconservatism, has even named this trend "neonationalism", for conservatism proclaims the "special American mission" to bring "the light of civilization and democracy" to the world. This messianic conception of American nationalism finds an echo in the Jewish messianism of the Zionists who believe the Jews to be the bearers of civilisation, enlightenment and high moral ideals.

One of the "postulates" of Zionist ideology is the assertion that all Jews are united by a common past connected with ancient Palestine. Memories of the past that are echoed in religious ritual and kept rigid in Judaic "values" handed down from generation to generation, religious morality, the Jewish family with its patriarchal traditions, and the Jewish community which is envisaged as an extended version of the family are all, from

the point of view of Zionist ideology, the essence of Jewish culture. And here the Zionists are fully supported by American conservatism with its puritanical, orthodox religion and its demands to suppress individual desires in the name of bourgeois conventionalities.

This kind of cultural conservatism and the attempt to preserve individual norms of religious morality and turn them into social and ethical norms appear in practice today in the fact that certain Zionists and pro-Zionists align themselves not only with the moderate conservative sections of American society, but also with openly right-wing, reactionary organisations that are penetrated with anti-Sovietism, organisations like, for example, the Christian-fundamentalist organisation, "The Moral Majority". Seymour Lipset admits that in the United States "religious fundamentalism and cultural conservatism have long gone together. . . Religious identity is, after all, bound up with cultural tradition as part of a total way of life."⁷

The fundamentalists, like the neoconservatives, look upon culture as a totality of rigid dogma designed to maintain the *status quo*, i.e., inequality, and not as the living, dynamic and constantly changing cultural world of mankind. It is just this desire to preserve and strengthen the social hierarchy that makes the Zionists and neoconservatives appeal to the traditional "values" of family and politicised religious and moral "values". In all these "values", whether it be the American or Jewish model of the patriarchal family, the Christian or the Judaic religion, it is the conservative and the conformist elements which stand out. The ideology itself and religious and cultural membership do not in this case play any determining role.

This kind of tendency to foist upon American society a conformist ideology is in the interests of both Zionists and neoconservative bourgeois ideologists. The former try with the aid of conformist slogans to strengthen nationalist attitudes among the Jewish intelligentsia and submit them to their influence under the guise of "solidarity with the group", i.e., with the Jewish community, or, to be more precise, with its pro-Zionist leadership, and both try either to crush the democratic elements among the American, and particularly the American Jewish, intelligentsia or to force it to spread pro-American establishment pro-

paganda, and the American establishment is partly made up of influential pro-Zionist circles among the Jewish community.

Thus the transition of part of the bourgeois leadership of the American Jewish community to the position of neoconservatism is conditioned by two factors. On the one hand, there is the close relationship between the Jewish bourgeoisie and the American establishment and the acceptance of its social, political and class positions; on the other, there is the influence of the Zionist propaganda of nationalism, solidarity with Israel, anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

Today the right wing of the Jewish establishment has together with the more reactionary anti-Soviet forces in the USA gone over to the attack, a fact which is borne out by the emergence of a number of new anti-Soviet and anti-communist organisations. One of these, the "Committee for the Free World", brings together prominent representatives of American and West European intellectual circles. This organisation, which is headed by the French bourgeois sociologist, Raymond Aron, includes the above-mentioned Sidney Hook, Nathan Glazer, Seymour Lipset and Sol Bellow. The leaders of the Committee also include the wife of Norman Podhoretz, Midge Decter, who frequently writes pro-Zionist and anti-Soviet articles for the *Commentary* magazine. The aim of the organisation, as defined by Midge Decter, is the defence of the non-communist world from the growing threat of totalitarianism.

The social, political and ideological alliance of the Zionists and neoconservatives has now taken on organisational form. The membership of these anti-Soviet organisations is almost unchanging and this points to the consolidation which has taken place among the neoconservative wing of the Jewish pro-Zionist establishment.

The organisational links between the Zionists and neoconservatives appear in the way in which they have interacted with and penetrated various US right-wing organisations and groups. Thus, for example, one of the strongest supports of neoconservatism is the pro-Zionist magazine *Commentary*, which is financed by the American Jewish Committee. The ideologists and apologists of neoconservatism include prominent members of the American Jewish community like Norman Podhoretz, the jour-

nalists Samuel Huntington, Aaron Wildavsky, Peter Drucker and many more American Jewish conservative intellectuals, Some right-wing Jewish organisations, like, for example, the American Jewish Forum, which was founded in January 1981 and is headed by M. Siegel, professor of theology and one of the pro-Zionist leaders of the Jewish community, and the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs, are the main centres of support for the American Jewish neoconservative bourgeoisie.

The leaders of the Jewish community often occupy high posts in the US administration or at least have close ties with it. Thus there is Eugene Rostow, a well-known political figure, Max Kampelman who headed the American delegation to the Madrid talks, and Lyn Nofziger, presidential aide on political affairs. Their interests are largely those of the American ruling elite and the leaders of the US Jewish community.

The support given by the Zionist organisations and the leaders of the Jewish community for the neoconservative circles that form the present entourage of President Reagan is at the same time a way to strengthen the political position of Zionism itself and the Jewish establishment. Frequently key posts in the Jewish community are taken by those who occupy high positions in the American administration.

The fact that the Zionist and pro-Zionist part of the Jewish community, including the Jewish intelligentsia, has gone over to neoconservatism should be looked upon as an integral part of the consolidation of all right-wing groups in the United States and at the same time as a process by which the American Jewish public is stratified according to its social and political orientation.

* * *

The adoption on the part of certain bourgeois groups among the American Jewish population of neoconservative positions and the strengthening of contacts between Zionists and other reactionary groups on the American political scene does not, however, mean that the swing to the right has included all American Jews. In fact, a directly opposite tendency has been taking place among American Jewry. The neoconservatives and Zionists

have been arousing growing criticism in the Jewish community. As public opinion polls show, the majority of American Jews are critical of the foreign and domestic policies of the Reagan administration. Thus in the spring of 1982 70 per cent of Jewish Americans were discontented with Ronald Reagan as a President. At the same time there was growing discontent with the extremist actions of the Israeli government. This is explained primarily by the Israeli government's aggressive foreign policy, which runs counter to the liberal views of the middle strata of the Jewish intelligentsia in the United States.

It should be emphasised that a considerable part of the Jewish intelligentsia that is not directly connected with the administration and therefore maintains a relative independence of judgement holds a more liberal position in matters of foreign policy.

According to CBS, American Jews have more realistic views than the rest of the population of the United States on relations with the Soviet Union. 41 per cent, as against 31 per cent of non-Jews, were against increasing anti-Sovietism. Research undertaken by *The New York Times* and CBS jointly showed that "in a nationwide... survey in the fall of 1978, which questioned close to 9,000 on both domestic and foreign policy issues, Jews were found to be more liberal than any other white group".⁸

The majority of American Jews have always supported détente, arms control and a just solution to the Middle East conflict with the participation of all interested parties. They have also been for talks with the Soviet Union on the most important issues of international politics.

It must also be recognised that anti-Semitism and open racism that have always characterised the extreme right-wingers in America have driven the more moderate sections of the American Jewish intellectual elite away from them. Despite the considerable swing to the right among the Jewish population in the USA, the liberal moderate wing is still in the majority. A large number of Jews, for example, belong to the liberal organisation "Americans for Democratic Action". But this progressiveness on their part should not be exaggerated, for among the bourgeois liberals there is much anti-Soviet and anti-communist feeling. At the same time American, including the Jewish, liberals are

critical of the present policies of the Reagan administration on a number of important issues.

Despite the Zionist and American bourgeois propaganda of a "Soviet military threat", some prominent members of the American Jewish community support the "Americans for SALT" organisation. Other left-wing organisations that are also active in the struggle for detente include the Women Federation of Emma Lazarus and the Jewish Cultural Clubs. These organisations, together with realistically-minded persons among the American Jewish community and the Jewish intellectuals, condemned the Israeli government's aggressive adventurist policies. They believe it essential to establish contact with the PLO and recognise the important role of the Soviet Union in establishing a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Among the Jewish intelligentsia in the United States there are numerous progressive and democratically-minded groups. The Communist Party USA has great influence on their outlook. Twenty per cent of those who attended its congress in 1979 were of Jewish extraction.

In December 1980 democratic representatives of the Jewish population in the United States formed an organisation entitled "New Jewish Agenda" which advocates democratising the Jewish community in the country. 700 people took part in its founding congress including such well-known public figures as Rabbi Hertzell Matt and Gerald Serotta. In their declaration the members of this organisation categorically renounced the right wing of the American Jewish establishment and the Zionist leaders of the Jewish community. "New Jewish Agenda," they declared, "was founded because growing and widening sectors of the Jewish population find themselves in contention with the policies of the American Jewish establishment."⁹ The declaration made a demand for direct talks between Israel and the PLO. However, even democratic sections of American Jewish public opinion are not always free from the influence of pro-Zionist, nationalist ideas.

Despite the large number of errors contained in the declaration and programme of the "New Jewish Agenda", the CP USA, while expressing its basic disagreement with it, nevertheless considered it necessary to support this organisation. This support

means solidarity with those democratic sections of the Jewish public which try to set themselves apart from the right wing of the Jewish establishment and oppose the policies of the Reagan administration.

One of the ideological centres of the democratic sectors of the American public is the Institute of Political Studies, which is financed by the Samuel Rubin Foundation (Rubin was the founder and owner of the Fabergé cosmetic factory). Since 1978 the president of the Institute has been Rubin's daughter, Kora Weis, and its active members include Marcus Ruskin, Sol Landau, Arthur Woskou and Len Rosenberg.

The main demand of the organisation is a sharp reduction in the military budget (by 50 per cent) and its members sharply criticise the "American way of life".

A section of American Jewry is highly critical of the aggressive, expansionist policies of the Reagan administration. For example, a group of prominent American, including Jewish, figures from the world of culture published an open letter in *The New York Times* opposing US intervention in El Salvador and military aid to its junta. Those that signed the letter included Bella Abzug, a social worker, Noam Chomsky, a scholar, a journalist, a Nobel Prize winner, the poet Allen Ginsberg and the writers E.L. Doctorow and Erica Long.

The neoconservative Zionist circles have virtually been opposed by the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, whose programme for 1981-1982 shows the presence of strong liberal trends in the Jewish community. Here the majority of key issues in foreign and domestic policies are assessed from the liberal standpoint. Thus the following proposals are set out with respect to domestic policy:

1. Full recognition for the "affirmative action" programme;
2. Tax increases for the middle classes so as to increase spending on the social services: health, aid to large families and invalids, etc;
3. Separation of the church from the state;
4. Desegregation of the schools.

The proposals made by the programme on foreign policy contain, despite the traditional call to "support Israel", demands to cut military spending. According to Murray Friedman, a

neoconservative who harshly criticised the programme, it was a "classic 'guns or butter' debate" in which the "butter side" came out on top.¹⁰ Neoconservative circles in the Jewish community and the Jewish establishment, who support *Commentary*, sharply attacked the programme for its "excessive liberalism" and "unrealistic approach".

The Israeli action in Lebanon revealed the deep contradictions and split in the American Jewish community. The pro-Zionist leadership of the community and US Zionist circles were through the good graces of Menachem Begin once more faced with the well-known dilemma: how to unite the traditional liberal, anti-military attitudes of American Jews with the present bloodshed and aggression committed by Israel? And how in these circumstances to preach solidarity with Israel?

The reaction of the American Jewish community and broad sections of the Jewish population can, on the whole, be characterised as passive and in some cases active dislike. However, many American Jews that have been confused by Zionist propaganda which looks upon any criticism of the Israeli government as an act of anti-Semitism, prefer to express their disagreement by eloquent silence. The well-known American sociologists, Nathan Glazer and Seymour Lipset, who only recently joined Podhoretz and the neoconservatives and later came out with a sharp criticism of the Israeli government, express their regret that as distinct from "Israelis [who] have spoken up in opposition to their Government's policies, American Jews have been largely silent, thereby possibly contributing to the Israeli Government's misperception that American Jews support it in this war".¹¹ Thanks to this attitude on the part of the liberals it is the voices of the neoconservatives among American Jewry that tend to be heard when they call for unconditional support for Israeli aggression. This, in particular, is true of the neoconservative group headed by Irving Kristol and Norman Podhoretz. In an article in *The New York Times* Podhoretz pronounced anathema on those "traitors" who turned their backs on Israel in its time of trouble. He stated quite openly that "in fighting to dislodge the PLO's hold on Lebanon, the Israelis are pursuing an objective that is in our interests no less than in theirs"¹² [here read: the interests of American imperialism.—*Author.*].

This kind of plain declaration is difficult to disagree with. US ruling circles really are interested in weakening the progressive national liberation forces in the Middle East in the person of the PLO, in deepening the split and contradictions between the Arab countries and in setting up a pro-American regime in Lebanon so as to strengthen the US position in the Middle East.

However, far from all American Jews support Israel, as Zionist propaganda would have it, in this act of inhumanity on the part of Israel. And discontent is growing to the point where it is now affecting Jewish neoconservatives as well as liberals. Sixty-seven prominent members of the Jewish public in the United States signed a letter supporting the progressive organisation "Peace Now Movement" in Israel, which stands for a peaceful and just solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. Among those who signed the letter were a number of prominent leaders of the Jewish community like Rabbs Balfour Brickner and Hans Jonas, the editors of the influential Jewish publications *Moment* and *Dissent* Leonard Fein and Irving Howe, well-known American Jewish intellectuals Sol Bellow, Alfred Kazin, E. L. Doctorow, Daniel Bell, Nathan Glazer and Seymour Lipset.

As Rabbi Brickner put it, "it's 'My country right or wrong'; but I've never adopted that for America and I'll be damned if I'll adopt it for Israel".¹³ Hans Jonas believes that many American Jews have reacted negatively to Israeli aggression, but fear of the pro-Zionist Jewish establishment has made them keep silent. "The official Jewish organisations cannot bring themselves to say this, but in the rank and file I can assure you there is a feeling of disgust, of shame, I know rabbis who feel exactly as I do who cannot express it because their congregations would be up in arms."¹⁴

But this statement already shows that the Zionist efforts to hush up those who are discontented with Israeli policy are not always crowned with success. The Israeli action in Lebanon has also been opposed by other prominent Jewish intellectuals including Professor Bernard Avishai, Nadav Safran, and Stanley Hoffman, chairman of the Centre of European Studies at Harvard University.

Thus, as distinct from the pro-Zionist and Zionist leaders of the Jewish community in the United States, Bernard Avishai

reveals the real causes of Israeli aggression: "Israel's stunning drive into Lebanon is not so much a response to terror and shelling from the North as an extreme effort to determine the fate of the West Bank and Gaza."¹⁵

Some Jewish Americans have published letters in *The New York Times* angrily condemning the Israeli invasion and the support given to it by the US administration. Thus a certain Bob Kalin stated directly that "without [US] financial and military underpinnings, Israel could not have embarked on, nor could it sustain this bloody and foolhardy course".¹⁶ The writer of the letter called upon the American Jewish community to raise its voice against the murder of Palestinians in Lebanon.

The protest voiced by the liberal section of American Jews can be heard not only in the United States itself, but in other countries too. In July 1982 two prominent leaders of the Jewish community, Philip Klutznik, a former president of the World Jewish Congress, and the now late Nahum Goldmann, honorary president of the World Jewish Congress, together with Pierre Mendès-France, a prominent figure in the French Jewish community, published a statement containing a sharp criticism of Begin's militarist policies. The statement contained the demand for an end to hostilities in Lebanon and the siege of Beirut.

Thus we can see that despite all the efforts of the Zionist propagandists to represent the American Jewish community as monolithic, the events in Lebanon have exposed the serious and deep contradictions with which it is rent. Dissatisfaction with Tel Aviv's adventurist policies may at any moment bubble over into discontent with the right-wing neoconservatives of the American Jewish establishment, who are the very people that support this mad and vicious policy.

In conclusion it should be said that the Jewish intellectuals who play a notable role in American cultural life are not a socially and politically homogeneous group. Part have very close ties with the American establishment, sharing its political and ideological principles. This is the result of the growing economic and social status of this stratum of the Jewish intelligentsia and its dependence on the American ruling elite, whose social imperative it is called on to fulfil. At the same time this group

maintains close contacts with the pro-Zionist leadership in the Jewish community and American Jewish bourgeois circles.

The leaders of the Jewish community, under the influence of Zionist ideas and the political guidelines of the American establishment, have made a notable contribution to the development of neoconservatism.

The separation of the neoconservative nucleus of the Jewish intelligentsia, on the one hand, points to its assimilation and simultaneous progression up the American hierarchical ladder, and, on the other, indicates the stratification that has taken place in the American Jewish community according to economic, social and political positions, and the priority given to social goals over the ethnic factor.

At the same time the neoconservatives represent a narrow, though fairly influential stratum in the Jewish public, which is also the most reactionary wing of the Jewish establishment that has merged with Zionist and other right-wing circles in the United States.

Despite the fact that there has been a general swing among American Jewish intellectuals to conservatism, the majority still remain liberal. The group of neoconservative Jewish intellectuals that are trying to speak in the name of all American Jews in fact only represent the interests of the privileged members of the Jewish establishment and fulfil the social imperative of the pro-Zionist leadership of the Jewish community and the ruling circles in the United States. On the contrary, the desire to reduce expenditure on the social needs, the escalation of the arms race and the increased tax burden that results from it have threatened the living standards of the Jewish people, including their working intelligentsia, and given rise to their growing resistance.

References

1. *Commentary*, November 1981, p. 28
2. *Ibid.*, April 1978, p. 59.
3. *Ibid.*, April 1981, pp. 35, 40.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
5. See Charles Kadushin, *The American Intellectual Elite*, Little, Brown and Co., Boston-Toronto, 1974, p. 301.

6. *The Nation*, July 9-16, 1977, p. 45.
7. *Commentary*, March 1981, p. 26.
8. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 454, Philadelphia, March 1981, p.77.
9. *Jewish Affairs*, July-August 1981, p. 10.
10. *Commentary*, December 1981, pp. 40-41, 42.
11. *The New York Times*, June 30, 1982.
12. *Ibid.*, June 15, 1982.
13. *International Herald Tribune*, July 17-18, 1982.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *The New York Times*, June 18, 1982.
16. *Ibid.*, June 17, 1982.

Ye. Demitriyev

**ZIONIST IDEAS
AS REFLECTED IN ISRAELI
GOVERNMENT POLICY
ON A MIDDLE
EAST SETTLEMENT
IN THE EARLY 1980s**

From the moment that the State of Israel was formed Zionism has been the dominating ideology and policy of its ruling circles whatever political coalition has been in power. Furthermore, the Israeli leadership has made increasing use of the state and political institutions to inculcate Zionist dogma among the masses, since by the early 1980s it had become clear that Zionism was beginning to lose its grip in Israel. This was because the "besieged fortress" condition in which the Israeli State had lived through its own fault for a period of nearly 35 years has seriously affected the attitudes of its population and those of the Diaspora Jews with the result that Zionism is losing its power of attraction even for the Jews living in Israel itself. According to Rabbi Irving Greenberg, director of the National Jewish Resource Centre, "growing emigration from Israel, coupled with a drop in immigration, suggests a waning of the magnetism of Central Jewish values and of Zionism".¹

When in May 1977 the Likud bloc came to power, Israel was under the illusion that the new, Begin government was really a cabinet that, in the words of its leader, "could rule". The last seven years (during this period there was a general election on June 30, 1981, in which the Likud was returned with a small majority) have dispelled the illusions of many Israelis. The late Moshe Dayan characterised the period thus: "Gallopung uncontrolled inflation...and the government incapable of stopping it... Lack of economic policy: one policy announced one day (and not implemented) and another policy trumpeted the next (and also not implemented). And no one in the Cabinet able to explain the government's policy or how inflation is to

be stopped or how the balance of payments deficit is to be reduced.”²

The clear incompetence of the Israeli rulers with regard to the economy can be seen in the sharp increase that there has been in the amount of money in circulation, which has inevitably led to rising prices in the domestic market and increased imports which have further contributed to the balance of payments deficit and increased foreign debt. The critical condition of the Israeli economy has been considerably worsened by the rise in military expenditure. Thus the “economic miracle” promised by Begin never came. Already two years after the 1977 election state spending had risen sharply and the number of civil servants and persons employed in the services sphere was 52 per cent of the working population. Each year the Israeli economy became more complicated and alarming.

Israel is a good example of interdependence of foreign and domestic policy in a bourgeois state. The worsening internal situation and increased economic difficulties have pushed the government into headlong adventurism in its foreign policy. Behind many of the foreign policy acts of the Israeli leadership during the early 1980s lay internal political undertones, the desire to weaken social conflict in the country by diverting attention to Israel’s international position.

In going through with the Camp David in October 1978 and in concluding a “peace treaty” with Egypt on March 26, 1979, the Zionist leadership in Israel was sure that these agreements would result in Egypt ultimately leaving the group of countries opposed to Israel and make it impossible in the foreseeable future to form any more or less serious anti-Israel coalition of Arab states.

Egypt’s late president, Sadat, agreed to the signing of the Camp David accords and a “peace treaty” with Israel in the belief that Washington, while being interested in forming an anti-Soviet “strategic consensus” of a few Middle East states and including Egypt in that “consensus”, would put pressure on Israel for it to make concessions over the Palestinian question. Then the isolation of Egypt in the Arab and Islamic world, an inevitable consequence of the Camp David capitulation, might significantly weaken and an agreement on the prin-

ciples of "administrative autonomy" for Palestinians on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip, for which Sadat held out high hopes, could be achieved to his credit.

Washington, for its part, based itself on the clearly erroneous supposition that the consistently deepening isolation of Egypt in the Arab world, the increasing social discontent and internal political tension in the country, and the evident collapse of the "economic miracle", which was supposed to occur in Egypt as a result of Sadat's policy of close cooperation with the United States, could be compensated for by American military and economic "aid".

These calculations both on the part of Sadat and the US administration were also erroneous for the fact that Begin, who had with US support removed the threat of further military and political confrontation between Egypt and Israel, considered himself in control of the situation and thus able to dictate Israeli-style conditions to both Egypt and the United States.

The failure of Sadat's attempts to at least partially change the obstructionist line taken by Israel on the Palestinian question and to get the tripartite talks on Palestinian autonomy off the ground showed to the whole world the treacherous workings of the Camp David agreements in relation to the Palestinians. After Sadat's murder it became quite clear that the withdrawal of Israeli troops in April 1982 from the last occupied third of the Sinai peninsula was essentially the result of an *a priori* refusal on the part of Egypt to make progress in solving the Palestinian problem.

Even before the withdrawal became a fact, the former director of the American Middle East Institute, Leonard Binder, said: "As the Camp David process drew to a close, it became clearer that it had only produced a separate peace between Egypt and Israel. Egypt had failed to open a bridge between Israel and the moderate Arab states, and Israel had failed to make any promising concession on the Palestine question."³ At the cost of conceding Sinai Israel not only established itself in the far more important from the political, strategic, economic and even religious points of view territories of the West Bank and Gaza, but virtually unambiguously affirmed its intention of directly annexing these lands in the same way as it had occu-

pied the Golan Heights and the Arab part of Jerusalem. This approach was fully in line with Zionist thinking. The Israeli political observer, Shlomo Avinery, stated directly in this connection that "Begin viewed Camp David as a unique opportunity to trade Sinai for the chance to bolster present Israeli control over the West Bank and Gaza and future permanent claim to them".⁴

It is especially important to stress that Israel's withdrawal from Sinai was not simply advantageous, but essential for the United States, since it restrained the new Egyptian President Mubarak from anti-Israeli and therefore anti-American acts. The American leadership could not but realise that Israel's refusal to withdraw its troops from Sinai would undermine the whole architecture of Camp David, accelerate Egypt's return to the united anti-Israeli front and finally destroy US hopes of attracting the "moderate" Arab countries into what Washington calls the "peace-creating process" in its American-Israeli scenario.

The political intentions of the Israeli leadership in relation to the Arab territories that were occupied after the Six Day War in June 1967, the exploitation of which is extremely important to the Israeli economy, have never been a secret, though they were disguised under notions about the importance of these lands for the achievement of Zionist "purely peaceful" aims.

This exploitation amounted, in the first place, to using these territories, including that of the Sinai peninsula, for political bargaining, and, second, it was clear from the start that Israel's ultimate aim was the annexation of a larger part of these lands. Israeli action in relation to the Golan Heights which were "incorporated" as part of Israel by extending Israeli legislation over these territories was analogous to its action over the Arab (Eastern) section of Jerusalem.

In laying claim to Palestinian lands, Israel advanced a whole load of groundless arguments, which could be divided into two kinds. On the one hand, it was said to be essential to keep these territories under Israeli control so as to ensure the "security" of Israel; on the other, these lands that for centuries had been owned by the Arabs were claimed to be "Biblical lands" which supposedly belonged to Israel by "God's law". But even the

American press in its comments on the claims of the Zionist Israeli leadership justly noted that "ancient history...is entirely inadmissible as a definition in international law or diplomacy".⁵ The thesis of the necessity to ensure the security of Israel is beyond any criticism, since the territorial enlargements that Israel has made at the expense of its Arab neighbours are the true reason for the deepening of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Official Israeli propaganda tries to present the territorial claims of the Israeli leadership on its Arab neighbours, irrespective of which coalition is in power in Israel, as different "orientations" in the foreign policy of the various Israeli political parties. The former director-general of the Israeli Foreign Ministry, Shlomo Avinery, wrote in an article in *The Jerusalem Post*: "The real political debate in Israel is not between doves and hawks. It is between those who believe Israel's policies should be determined by considerations of security and those who believe that its policy should be dictated by history."⁶ Avinery naively tries to assure his readers that these "debates" began only after the Six Day War. But even he was forced to admit that both the Likud and the Labour Party considered it essential for Israel to consolidate its hold on the Arab territories taken during the war, and that they had no differences in attitude to the problem of Jerusalem, which they considered to be eternally united under Israeli sovereignty.

The desire for more and more territorial claims, which continually appears in the various declarations and concrete actions of the Israeli leadership, has been brought into line with the demands of the day by implementation of the famous Zionist slogan-winning "land without people" (which is what the Zionists used to call Palestine) for a "people without land" (i.e., the Jews). The Zionists were never concerned about what the Arabs thought of their plans. The late Nahum Goldmann, a prominent Zionist leader in his time, said that "Zionism committed the unintentional error of ignoring the importance of the Arab attitude for the realization of Zionist aspirations".⁷ To describe the Zionist action as "unintentional" is disproved not only by the history of the formation of the State of Israel, but by the present policies of the Zionist leadership in that country. Examples from most recent times are known to everyone.

In the matter of choosing the time for annexing the Golan Heights the Israeli leadership very likely counted on the usual outbreak of serious inter-Arab disagreement, which this time was the result of the so-called Fahd Plan and the failure of Saudi hopes to get it accepted in the Arab world as a plan for a Middle East settlement at the first stage of the conference of the heads of Arab states and governments in Fez (Morocco) in November 1981.

The Fahd Plan was, naturally, turned down off-hand by the Israeli leadership who did not even want to hear about the formation of a Palestinian state.

The official reaction of Washington was more restrained. After the first, brief period of confusion some positive statements were made about the plan which contained a certain degree of flexibility and even a veiled criticism of the Camp David "peace formula". Congressman Paul McCloskey, who is well known for his pro-Israeli sympathies, stressed: "This is the only way we can proceed moving initially through the Camp David process, and hopefully correlating this process with the Saudi peace proposal."⁸

By the end of 1981 US policy in the Middle East could be characterised like this: there was the declared intention to begin a new stage in the "peace efforts" on the basis of the common aims of Camp David, which did not, however, exclude departing from the close framework and more odious aspects of the "Camp David scheme"; efforts were continued to form an anti-Soviet "strategic agreement" among the pro-Western regimes in the area, a proposal that was first made by Alexander Haig in spring 1981; there were attempts to make use of the Fahd Plan despite the fact that US Middle East policy was always anti-Palestinian in its approach to the majority of issues in the region.

Obviously, an effective symbiosis of the Camp David agreements and the Fahd Plan (from the point of view of the US administration) required as a prime condition the maximum weakening of the military, political and ideological force of the Palestinian Resistance Movement, which was always the main obstacle in the way of US-Israeli plans. Washington (let alone Israel) always considered equally unacceptable both aspects of

the Palestinian movement that determine its place in the inter-Arab and international arena: the forging of Arab unity through support for the Arab cause on an anti-imperialist, anti-Zionist basis, even at times despite the wishes of ruling circles in these countries, and the simultaneous process of the inevitable radicalisation of the Arab national liberation movement as a whole. For this reason the large-scale Israeli aggression in Lebanon was in full accordance with the long-term political and military objectives of Washington. It was, naturally, part of the framework of the now traditional policy of expansion and aggression against its Arab neighbours which for more than three decades now the Zionist leadership in Israel has conducted.

The physical annihilation of the armed forces of the Palestinian Resistance Movement and the destruction of the political structure of the PLO was in line with the interests of American policy in the Middle East which clearly relies on the use of force. In the Western, and particularly the American press there are numerous reports that the Reagan administration gave the green light to the Israeli aggression and that the American-Israeli contacts, including those at the highest level, held in the first half of 1982 had the particular objective of working out the details of the "operation" and "assigning roles". According to *Paris Match*, "in late January-early February 1982 everything was prepared for launching a major punitive raid".⁹ Particularly noteworthy was the information published in *The Middle East International* journal to the effect that the United States knew beforehand about the Israeli invasion as can be seen from the fact that two American warships arrived in the area immediately before the invasion. The *Kennedy* naval vessel was anchored not far from the Lebanese-Israeli coast, and the *Eisenhower* near the Island of Crete in order to observe the disposition of Soviet naval vessels. Both these ships had left their berth on June 1 so as to be in place on time.

A whole list of reasons could be given why Begin decided on large-scale anti-Palestinian aggression in Lebanon in June. Suffice it to recall the conflict between Britain and Argentina over the Falklands and note the complex character of inter-Arab relations, which made it possible for Israel to justifiably suppose that the reaction of the Arab countries to the Israeli in-

vasion would be feeble and uncoordinated. Finally, it should also be mentioned that there was an oil surplus on the world market, a clear instance of supply being higher than demand, which *a priori* made it pointless for the Arab oil producers to introduce an embargo.

It is highly characteristic that the decision to invade Lebanon was made by Begin at a time when Reagan and Haig were in Western Europe and occupied with problems of relations with their Western allies. Also, Vice-President George Bush and William Clark, head of the National Security Council, were both on a short holiday outside Washington. Obviously, this decision by Israel was also dictated in no small measure by the desire to localise possible accusations of coordinating its actions in Lebanon with Washington and create the impression that the American leadership was caught unawares. This approach, in the opinion of the Israeli leadership, made it possible for the United States to conduct large-scale political manoeuvring.

Many political observers think that the bombing of the nuclear centre in Baghdad in June 1981 and the massive Israeli invasion of South Lebanon in July of the same year were in fact rehearsals. Their main objective was to test reaction in the West, particularly in the United States, to the possibility of a full-scale war in Lebanon. And, convinced that there was nothing to fear, Begin decided to act.

In June 1982 the normal toleration for their annexation policy that the Israelis had come to expect from the US government turned into a terrible tragedy for the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples. Knowing the Israeli intentions Washington did not even raise a finger to stop Tel Aviv from implementing its criminal plans.

Declarations from highly placed persons in the US administration that Washington was "concerned" at the scale of the Lebanese-Palestinian tragedy are not worth a farthing. The mendacious character of these laments comes out particularly clearly against the background of the frank statements made by the Israeli leaders. "Relations between Israel and the United States have not worsened," said Sharon in an interview with the *Europeo* magazine. "The Americans... share our goals and agree with our programme... Our alliance with the United States

is based on mutual interest and the United States knows this perfectly well.” In the same interview Sharon went on to say that he had coordinated the aggressive plans with Haig and Weinberger as early as September 1981. In the then talks in Washington Sharon, in his own words, declared to his highly-placed listeners: “Do not pretend that you will be shocked when we do it [i.e., invade Lebanon.—*Author.*].”¹⁰

The objectives of the Israeli aggression in Lebanon can be divided into two groups: the overt objectives, those that lie on the surface and are borne out in one way or another by official Israeli declarations; and the covert objectives, those that are carefully concealed by the Zionists from public opinion.

The most obvious of the Israeli objectives in Lebanon were:

- the destruction of the military and political infrastructure of the PLO, the weakening of its political positions and undermining of its authority, and the complete withdrawal of the Palestinian armed forces from Lebanon;

- the strengthening of the puppet buffer enclave of Major Haddad in the south of Lebanon. According to the *International Herald Tribune*, “another possibility, officials say, would be to create a buffer zone under the control of... Maj.Saad Haddad... Prime Minister Menachem Begin in effect set the stage for such a zone... by turning over to Maj.Haddad the Beaufort Castle...”¹¹

- the weakening of the Muslims and the simultaneous strengthening of the right-wing Christians in the country’s political structure, the creation of the necessary conditions for forming such a government in Lebanon which would agree to sign a peace treaty with Israel that would include a special clause on ending the “Palestinian presence” on Lebanese territory in any form;

- the withdrawal of Syrian troops from Lebanon, which had been there as part of the Arab security forces on a decision of the League of Arab States;

- a demonstration of the power and “omnipotence” of Israel and its leading role in questions of war and peace in the Middle East.

These objectives clearly reflect the ideas of militant Zionism, which is the ideological basis for the actions of the Israeli gov-

ernment. Another characteristic circumstance is the fact that the Israeli government and the international Zionist organisations have taken great pains to somehow justify the crimes committed by the Israeli military in Lebanon in the eyes of the world public. In many countries the Jewish communities have been called upon to give a practical demonstration of their support for Israel and its action in Lebanon at the precise moment when indignation at this action was growing throughout the world.

The Zionist leaders have always maintained that support for Israel is the essential condition for all Zionists and the duty of every Jew wherever he may live.

But the Israeli aggression in Lebanon showed that even individual Zionist organisations abroad, particularly in the United States, would not wholly support such bloodshed and genocide against the Palestinian and Arab peoples in Lebanon, for the indignation of the world was too great at these clear examples of the expansionist nature of Zionism. Once more (and how many times is this!) was the correctness of the UN General Assembly borne out, when at its 30th session in 1975 (November 10) it adopted by a majority of votes the well-known Resolution No. 3379 in which Zionism was characterised as a form of racism and racial discrimination.

Returning to the events of the summer and autumn of 1982 in Lebanon mention should be made of the covert objectives of the Israeli aggression. First of all, there was the opportunity to use the southern part of Lebanon (as far as the River Litani, the so-called red line) for the economic development of Israel, and particularly for providing parts of the country with fresh water. Immediately after the Israeli aggression started and the southern part of Lebanon was occupied, reports were carried in the American press that the Israeli government was sending to Lebanon "experienced civilian and military administrators from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip to enable it [Israel] to run civilian affairs in the southern portion of the country for a long period".¹² The London *Times* wrote that in the occupied parts of Lebanon such work was being carried out as not only attested to Tel Aviv's intentions to maintain in some form or other its occupation of the land but confirmed that Israeli plans were of a long-term nature. These plans included "the construction of

new roads and buildings. . . and the consolidation of local water sources".¹³ The Israeli leadership consistently avoided any specific declarations on this matter but several members of the government expressed themselves quite clearly on the issue. Thus Youval Ne'eman, a parliamentary deputy of the Hatahiya Party, which is part of the ruling right-wing Zionist coalition, stressed that the long stay of Israeli troops in Lebanon would help bring peace to Galilee. The Israeli armed forces, he claimed, could guarantee security more reliably than a multinational peace-keeping force, and Israel would be able to achieve a definite level in the social, economic and technical development of the region, which geographically and historically was an inalienable part of "Greater Israel". Furthermore, Israel might even be able to come to an agreement with Lebanon to change their mutual borders.

The second covert objective of Israeli aggression in Lebanon bore a frankly provocative character and amounted to allowing the wave of Palestinian terrorist activity to increase against Israel and, possibly, the USA in response to the crude military acts of the Israelis and their right-Christian allies. An increase in "Palestinian terrorism" would make it possible for the Israeli government to maintain the internal tension and divert public opinion from the complex domestic, especially economic problems. Furthermore, instances of Palestinian terrorism could be directly used by Israel's leadership to justify its long-term occupation of Lebanon, to step up its armed acts against the Palestinians and to refuse to participate in any settlement of the Palestinian problem whatever from it might take.

The intention of the Israeli leaders to crush the Palestinians militarily reveals one further objective pursued by Tel Aviv. This was to pave the way for the direct annexation of the West Bank and Gaza and for holding talks on so-called administrative autonomy for the Palestinians on Israeli terms. This was directly indicated in the American press. A report in *The Washington Post* stated: "Without the PLO in Beirut, thinking here goes, the West Bank's nationalist leaders will lose support and be replaced by others willing to work with Israeli occupation authorities. Thus relieved of demands from the PLO and the West Bank for genuine self-determination, Israel, Egypt and the

United States can come relatively easily to an agreement on West Bank autonomy that does not challenge permanent Israeli sovereignty or increased Jewish presence in the area, officials predict."¹⁴

The "administrative autonomy" of the Palestinian territories should, in the opinion of the Israeli leadership and the US administration, become the final solution of the Palestinian problem. However, US-Israeli plans for such autonomy have nothing in common with the problem of securing the genuine national rights of the Palestinian Arabs. The tripartite Egyptian-Israeli-US talks on ways to implement these plans are an open attempt to "solve" the Palestinian problem without the Palestinians and against their interests. So far these talks, which were begun in May 1979, have brought no results. This is because the Israeli position at the talks is clearly obstructionist and there has been no change in it since May 1979. This position boils down to three points:

- the autonomy of the West Bank and Gaza should be based on the juridical status of the people living there and not on the territories themselves;
- responsibility for self-rule on the West Bank and the Gaza strip will remain with Israel, through its military government;
- the authorities of self-ruling councils to be elected will be largely restricted to social and educative services; they will not have the right to enact legislation.¹⁵

It is characteristic that even today when the Palestinian movement is working under the most difficult conditions as a result of the Israeli aggression in Lebanon in 1982, the Israeli "programme" for the Palestinian question demonstrates how far the Zionist leadership in Israel has departed from reality. Despite the withdrawal of a large part of the Palestinian units from Lebanon, the Palestinian problem has still not yet been solved. The "new" American proposals that President Reagan made on September 1, 1982 could not ignore this fact. And although the "Reagan Plan" was based on the so-called "Jordanian option" for the solution to the problem, i.e., it virtually ignored the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and the formation of their own state, it could be seen as an indication of US disapproval of Israeli plans to directly annex the

West Bank and Gaza. There can be no doubt that the Palestinian problem remains, as before, the dominant factor in Middle East politics and exerts an inevitable influence over the policies of practically all states involved in the area, including the United States.

Convinced of the fruitlessness of trying to form an anti-Soviet "strategic consensus" and virtually admitting the lack of any real chances to revive the "Camp David peace process", the US government now basically relies on the proposals made by President Reagan on September 1, 1982. Here official Washington is relying very much on cooperation with the American Jewish community and the Zionist organisations in the USA. In general outline the picture is of the United States trying to offer the Palestinians the old goods of "administrative autonomy" and telling them that the "Jordanian option" for the solution to the Palestinian problem will "suit everyone". The Israeli government at the same time rejects the slightest attempts on the part of the United States to even mention the need for a solution to this problem among the complex of issues affecting a Middle East settlement. In other words, Washington is saying to the Arabs, particularly the Palestinians: "Agree to administrative autonomy under the Israeli occupation forces, otherwise Israel may take fresh action and it will be too late."

Obviously, this approach will not bring the peoples of this explosive region of the world any nearer to the achievement of a just and lasting peace.

* * *

The whole history of international Zionism is an example of how bourgeois nationalism, blown up to extremes, becomes militant chauvinism, one of the most dangerous forms of racism and racial discrimination. The events of the early 1980s have once more shown the bestial nature of Zionism and exposed—for the umpteenth time!—the inhumane character of Zionist ideas.

The American-Israeli strategic alliance makes Israel's foreign policy extremely dangerous. Furthermore, international Zionism has not renounced its plans for a "Greater Israel" and one of the attempts to fulfil them was the invasion of Lebanon. The

imperialist "division of labour"—whereby Israel has the dirty work of forcibly suppressing the Palestinians, while Washington uses diplomatic manoeuvring to try and split the various Palestinian organisations and individual Palestinian leaders and set them against each other—fools no one. Only US support makes it possible for the Zionists to sabotage a stable and constructive peace in the Middle East that is based on justice for all.

The way to establish this, the only possible kind of peace, which is not to the liking of the Zionists, has been set out in the Soviet proposals for a settlement of the Middle East conflict, which were put forward in September 1982. The truth is that a genuine peace in the Middle East is only possible if the national interests of all peoples and states in the area are taken account of and satisfied. Until the Israeli leaders renounce the racist ideas of militant Zionism, the Middle East situation will remain tense and potentially explosive. And they will also have to renounce their long-exposed annexationist plans, when they are faced with powerful resistance from a united Arab front supported by all those who want a genuine peace and a peaceful solution to international disputes and problems. The creation of such a front is the object of all genuine Arab patriots and all political forces that support the Arab countries and peoples in their just struggle to prevent the aggressive ideas of Zionism, which Zionist ruling circles in Israel have been pursuing for three and a half decades, from being put into practice.

References

1. *The New York Times Magazine*, December 7, 1980, p. 44.
2. *Middle East International*, No. 107, August 31, 1979, p. 9.
3. *Current History*, January 1982, p. 40.
4. *Foreign Policy*, No. 46, 1982, p. 22.
5. *International Herald Tribune*, September 30, 1977, p. 4.
6. *The Jerusalem Post*, May 1980, p. 7.
7. *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 57, No. 1, 1978, p. 74.
8. *Congressional Record. Extensions of Remarks*, December 16, 1981, p. E 5907.
9. *Paris Match*, No. 1725, 18 juin, 1982, p. 73.

10. *Europeo*, 6. IX. 1982.
11. *International Herald Tribune*, June 11, 1982, p. 2
12. *The Washington Post*, June 13, 1982.
13. *The Times*, July 12, 1982.
14. *The Washington Post*, July 3, 1982.
15. See *The New York Times*, May 4, 1979.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

ZIONISM—Enemy of Peace and Social Progress

The third issue of the collection, **Zionism—Enemy of Peace and Social Progress**, is devoted to the analysis and criticism of the various ideological trends in international Zionism, to the study of the salient features of its current structure. The wealth of data presented in the collection exposes Zionism as tool of the most reactionary, anti-Soviet and anti-communist forces of imperialism.